

OFFICIAL

WAI 60
#A2

**BACKGROUND REPORT
FOR THE WAI 60 CLAIM**

Gael Ferguson, B.T.P.; M. Phil [History]

May 1995

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction

Part I Background Policy

Section 2 Nineteenth Century Policy

- 2.1 Rural Vision: Suburban Dream
- 2.2 Nineteenth Century Policy for Maori

Section 3 1900 - 1935

- 3.1 "Mainstream" Housing
- 3.2 Maori Access to Housing Resources: 1900 - 1935

Section 4 1935 - 1950

- 4.1 Mainstream Policy
- 4.2 Maori Housing: 1935-1950

Section 5 1950

- 5.1 Mainstream Housing Policies: 1950 - 1972
- 5.2 Maori Housing: 1950 - 1972

Part 2 Wai 60 Claim

Section 6 Expanded Chronology

Section 7 Comments on the Chronology

Conclusion

Section 1: Introduction

This background report was commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal in 1994. It was to provide an overview of housing policy as it has affected Maori, with particular emphasis on analysing attitudes and policies relating to the integration and assimilation of Maori into European based culture. It was also to place the Wai 60 claim within the policy context.

The four main government bodies that delivered housing assistance to Maori over the last hundred years are the Department of Maori Affairs, the State Advances Corporation, the Housing Department (subsequently the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works) and the Housing Corporation which from 1974 combined the two latter organisations. The Department of Maori Affairs had the responsibility of providing specific resources, support and services to the Maori population. The State Advances Corporation and the Housing Division had the responsibility of delivering housing resources to those New Zealander's deemed to be deserving of state assistance.

Although Maori theoretically had access to both these sources of support in reality they were effectively excluded in any numbers from mainstream housing assistance until the 1950s. From that time Maori were to gain increased access to state housing albeit through a separate pool system.

The key factors that affected the delivery housing resources to Maori are:

- The refusal and/or reluctance of financial agencies including the government to lend on multiple ownership Maori land until 1984 when special provisions were introduced. This was a key factor in forcing rural Maori to seek assistance, either through the Department of Maori Affairs or the State Advances Corporation. It was also a major factor in Maori seeking employment in the towns and was to be influential in the continued alienation of land in the twentieth century. One result was that Maori became vulnerable to housing policies that were embedded in inherited European notions of settlement and family life.

These housing policies were not originally devised to assimilate Maori into Pakeha culture - indeed the expectation until the late 1940s was that Maori would pursue a different future using different processes and legislation. The result however was assimilationist and by the late 1950s has become consciously so.

- Assimilationist policies: general

The dominant theme of government housing policies was their use to assimilate all New Zealanders into a particular way of life - the separate family of mother father and children living in the suburbs.

These assimilationist policies had a major influence on Maori but a distinction needs to be made between these general policies which Maori became caught up in and the deliberately assimilationist policies specifically aimed at Maori from the 1950s. The two strands were often intertwined but it is important that the two parallel themes are understood.

Government attitudes to the role of the state in the promotion of family life - and the use of housing policy as a key mechanism to promote it would dictate the course of housing policy for one hundred years. Family life from the earliest years of British settlement was seen as central to social stability and government housing policy consistently made the delivery of housing resources to the family the key focus for distribution of resources. This model of the family was at odds with Maori whanau systems and was to be a major barrier to Maori receiving mainstream housing resources.

Larger families were catered for as an exception to the rule for whom special provisions had to be made. Generally provision for larger and extended Maori families was only possible through the Department of Maori Affairs until the late 1960s. Extended families or families consisting of grandparents and grandchild were also excluded in practice if not officially.

For many years Maori applicants for mainstream housing had to prove that they lived in the European manner. This meant a rejection of extended family arrangements. The model of the nuclear family was given priority in all state lending programmes until well into the 1970s when some provision was made for lending to other groups.

Single people were explicitly excluded from state housing until well into the 1970s. This included single elderly people until the late 1950s and early 1960s. Few gained access to state lending until the same period and the programmes that were created were always seen as exceptions.

The state also saw itself as the protector of this suburban dream - to prevent its inhabitants from being unduly influenced by alternative ways of living. Unmarried mothers were seen as a threat and were excluded until sheer pressure of numbers and the poor housing conditions they experienced forced their admission to state housing on an adhoc basis during the late 1960s. Maori and their alternative ways of life were also seen as threatening.

The issue became especially problematic from the late 1940s when urban Maori began to gain access to state housing within the main state suburbs. The response was pepper-potting - the scattering of Maori and later solo parents among Pakeha families to reduce the dangers of their influence.

A final theme was the need to maintain the concept that the suburb was both the symbol of and a mechanism for delivering the egalitarian society in New Zealand. This notion of the classless suburb could only be maintained if there were no obvious differences between people living in these areas. For officials and politicians there was a fear that the 'congregating' of Maori in one place would imply the existence of ghettos and the failure of the New Zealand social vision. Pepper-potting was again the solution.

The reality, however, was that as Maori were forced into state housing as a welfare tenure the concentrations became more and more difficult to avoid.

- Assimilationist and integrationist policies: specific to Maori. This issue runs as a major theme through the history of delivery of housing resources to Maori from the late 1930s. It affected both mainstream and Department of Maori Affairs policy and administration.

The Department of Maori Affairs was the primary government organisation involved in articulating these more specific policies. The State Advances Corporation and the Housing Division were more concerned with the mainstream assimilationist policies and the protection of the suburb.

The separate housing legislation for Maori in the 1930s was seen as an opportunity to raise the physical housing conditions of rural Maori. In the process it was hoped that these physical conditions would 'elevate' Maori making them more interested and willing to adopt many of the benefits of a European way of life. This was an issue from the turn of the century with debates among Maori reformers about the kind of housing that should be provided. This was to continue as a theme from the 1950s as the Department of Maori Affairs pushed for greater access for Maori in the urban areas.

Most significantly, during the 1950s the notion of pepper-potting was also seized upon by both the Department and the State Advances Corporation officials as a useful mechanism to encourage Maori to adopt a Pakeha way of life. Thus pepper-potting served a number of purposes.

These assimilationist policies were tempered in the early 1960s when officials and other commentators began to recognise the validity of Maori retaining aspects of their culture. The Hunn report presented the beginnings of such an integrationist approach although it continued to emphasise the importance of Maori having access to the same kinds of housing resources as Pakeha if they were to participate fully in national life. These policies, however, did not challenge the emphasis on the nuclear family, the suburban model or on a particular kind of housing design. This was to come later - from the 1970s when Maori began to press more insistently for urban marae, for appropriate designs, for recognition of the problems of urban as well as rural Maori in the housing market and for better delivery systems.

- The late development of an explicitly welfare function. A housing welfare policy targeted to the poorest groups did not emerge in a consistent and comprehensive form until the 1980s. Previously there was an insistence that the housing conditions of the country's poorest would be resolved indirectly - something that had a direct impact on Maori, with so many of them located amongst the country's lowest income earners.

State lending was intended ultimately to solve the shortage of housing and consequent poor conditions by boosting the construction of housing. The first Labour government also used state housing for the same purpose, while providing for an alternative tenure for those who could afford the rents. The very poor would benefit by a trickle down effect of better housing and lowered costs. Those provided with assistance had to be capable of repaying unsubsidised rents and mortgage finance. Housing assistance was to go to moderate income families in poor housing conditions.

The history of mainstream housing assistance is one of gradual undermining of this principle from the 1940s - for a number of reasons, including challenges from Maori. The result was a slow gaining of entry by Maori into mainstream housing resources.

The concept of "deserving" was always a criterion for access to mainstream housing resources well into the 1960s. This was at times explicitly stated as part of official policy. A deserving recipient was one who shored thrift and lived a respectable married life. A respectable life was also defined, when officials were confronted with Maori applicants, by a test that they must live in 'the European manner'. A key concern appears to have been the existence of the extended family.

- the development of a parallel system of delivery via the Department of Maori Affairs.

Initially a specifically "housing welfare" function for Maori was to be provided through the Department of Maori Affairs - first through health programmes, Maori land development schemes from the 1930s and finally through legislation for the delivery of Maori housing. But even this was coloured by attitudes to cost recovery. The development of housing assistance for landless and poor urban and rural Maori is a history that runs parallel to changing attitudes in mainstream policy.

The result of the parallel systems was a constant to-ing and fro-ing between departments as each sought to identify their specific responsibilities towards Maori and the rights of Maori as citizens to mainstream housing resources. Confusion and overlapping roles often resulted.

Part 1 of this paper provides a chronology of this experience. Each section contains a summary of the key points of mainstream housing policy as a background to discussing the specifics of delivery to Maori. Understanding the underlying assumptions of these general policies is essential to understanding the direction of Maori housing policy. A description of specific provision for Maori is then provided in a way that takes account of the factors discussed above.

Part 2 of the document outlines an expanded chronology of events associated with Takapuwahia C2A3 along with a commentary on that chronology. It concludes with an assessment of how assimilationist policies may have affected the course of events.

Section 2 : 1840 - 1901

During this period three areas of government policy affected housing conditions. These were: provision of relief and shelter for those considered unable to fend for themselves; introducing public health reforms to eradicate disease and rid the towns of slums which had become all too apparent by the 1860s; and finally, promoting first a rural and then a suburban vision of settlement, of family and the home. Only the last was carried out with any enthusiasm and none was intended to address the growing problems of Maori during that period. For Maori, the chief impact of the period was the loss of land through war, confiscation and later purchase. Nonetheless, the development of housing policies during the 19th century had a profound impact on the way housing was to be delivered after the turn of the century and on the way housing resources were to be delivered to Maori.

The state was to have only a limited role in 19th century New Zealand life. Rigid and often harsh distinctions were made between those considered deserving of state charity and those thought to be able to care for themselves. Charity was seen to create dependency on the state, and to ensure that such dependency did not occur help was usually meagre and grudgingly given. The only acceptable role for government was to ease the way of "respectable" able-bodied settlers into the life of the rural settler. This developed into the view that temporary release of public resources to help the worthy immigrant to pursue their dream of material progress was a legitimate role of the state - legitimate, that is, so long as there was no subsidy.

The result of such attitudes was a series of policies aimed at mainly skilled and semi-skilled working people, the able-bodied working actively to pursue the rural dream. Thrift, marriage, family life and a willingness to leave the towns for a future as a rural pioneer was proof of respectability. The following discussion gives a brief outline of the relevant government policies during the period and then discusses their implications for Maori.

2.1 Rural Vision: Suburban Dream

Immigrants brought with them to the new country images and ideas that had evolved to help them deal with a new era of industrialisation in Britain and Europe. The explosion of urban growth from the late 18th century had brought disaster to many of the towns - in the form of overcrowding and disease. A new language emerged that rejected the image of the City as a centre of art, culture and government and praised the natural world. Some critics of the towns hankered after an idealised rural society based on a sense of order, place and social responsibility. Others exalted the individual, unconstrained by restrictive social structures, existing in a wild and equally unconstrained natural world.

The vision of the individual unconstrained by the old caste system appealed to the rising middle classes who obtained their wealth from industry but they were convinced of the need for social order - especially where it allowed freedom to pursue business interests. In a society such as England, social relations during the late 18th century and early 19th century were based increasingly on the idea of the individual and less on older notions of caste, and the responsibilities and obligations that resulted from a person's place in that system. In this climate, a material vision was essential to social stability for it bound individuals to a collective, attainable goal which would be the reward for individual labour and endeavour.

The middle classes reworked the romanticism of the period into a unique compromise between life in nature and life in the towns - the suburb. The vision of this group was of the pre-eminence and virtue of nature - but nature that tamed and enclosed behind the garden wall. The family, no longer essential to the production of wealth was to become the centre of consumption - in a new tranquil ordered suburb of detached family homes set in their own "piece of nature".

This emphasis on a material vision was also essential in a new colony where the possibility of an almost anarchic situation was always possible and always feared. The links between stability and prosperity were encapsulated in the notion of the family, of the detached family home and life away from the poverty and disorder found in the centre of the towns.

Initially in New Zealand, the suburban vision of the English middle classes was largely irrelevant as settlers focused on a rural future. However, the ideas of the individual and the family did survive the journey. The new settlers would carve out a family home and garden turning the frightening space or claustrophobic bush into something more familiar. The settler would transform wild nature into a new rural order. The home and garden represented the conversion of nature and were a just reward for labour. The family was the basis of and the reason for the hard work needed to undertake this transformation.

Not everyone subscribed to this vision. Many, such as swaggers and single men travelling from farm to farm and town to town, did not. But respectable life, and the likelihood of receiving government help with settlement was dependent on subscribing to this vision. New Zealand governments were to endorse and support this vision of rural settlement well into the next century, in pursuit of stability, certainty and consequent wealth.

Government support for rural settlement began in the 1850s when Governor George Grey allowed the sale of Crown Lands at a reduced price to encourage settlers. It continued during the 1860s and 1870s with state support for forcible opening up of Maori lands for settlement through war and later through the courts. Julius Vogel borrowed heavily in the 1870s to fund large-scale public works to open up the rural areas particularly in the North Island.

But from the 1880s the rural dream faltered - quick material reward for settlers did not always come - and the life of settlers on some of the smaller farms was extremely hard. Land costs were to be high until war forced the opening up of the North Island on a large scale. Technological innovation also helped but the capital costs of clearing and settling the land were crippling. Even more worrying was the fact the towns were not showing signs of disappearing as rural settlements were established. They were rapidly becoming a source of wealth and advancement for some, a source of work for others and for many, a place of respite from the hardships of rural life. During the 1880s, speculation in suburban lands became rife, especially around Auckland as the wealthy tried to avoid the growing ills of the town centres. The old suburban vision was reborn as the rural vision faltered.

The wealthy who adopted the new suburban life nonetheless believed in the rigours of the rural life and the virtues of family life as the basis for social stability. During the 1880s they were fearful of three things: the growing presence of the destitute in the towns; and second, the growing number of able-bodied unemployed in the towns from 1879 with the down-turn of the economy. By the 1880s it seemed that the opportunities for rural advancement were limited and town-dwellers were fearful of the growing presence of a seemingly entrenched urban working class, especially an 'under-class' of unskilled workers. The third trend was a fear that the family, that bastion of social order and individual endeavour, was under threat. In the rural vision, the family home symbolised advancement, opportunity and reward.

Town dwellers also aspired to a private family home but it was often unachievable and many were forced to use their homes for boarders and lodgers. The result appeared to compromise the dream as many of the apparently separate houses were used as tenements - with rooms let and sublet for individuals and families. Boarding houses and lodging houses also became common - and not just for single or transient workers but also for the respectable skilled worker. Below these could be found the common lodging houses and the doss houses.

The appearance of tenements and boarding houses seemed to be entrenching a feared way of town life, of the individual outside the family, of transience and disorder. It threatened the rural vision because old expectations of rural settlement were no longer so certain. It threatened the wealthy suburban dweller with the possibility of disease and the potential for urban discontent. The government addressed these issues in three ways: through a system of charitable aid, through public health reforms and from 1894 further initiatives to promote rural settlement.

Charitable aid had been available since the 1850s when government funded hospitals, and police and immigration officials dispensed relief. This was taken over by provincial governments in 1852 and relinquished again to central government in 1876. In 1885 the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act was passed in an attempt to systematise charitable aid and to rein in increasing expenditure. This was the first form of state relief for the poor - and offered some help with housing conditions. It was not a conscious housing policy. The charitable aid system operated on the distinction between the able-bodied and the deserving poor. The former were judged to be capable of work and improvement, and through their own failure of character, to be the cause of their misery.

Until the 1880s when the numbers of unemployed increased markedly, lack of employment was not seen as reason to receive relief. Working on public works schemes was a necessary precursor to assistance.

The "deserving poor" were the ill, the disabled, the old and the mentally ill. Widows, particularly those with children, were also deserving of consideration. Women whose husbands had abandoned them were often seen as authors of their own fate, although if there were children, help was reluctantly given. Indeed reluctance and meagreness characterised the system. Both government and charities set aid to a minimum level necessary to keep a person alive, so as to discourage dependence. Applying for relief was often made a humiliating process.

Three kinds of relief were possible: outdoor relief - usually in the form of food and clothing but sometimes in the form of rents; indoor relief or supervised shelter for the elderly and for women needing care during pregnancy. Sometimes the homeless and young women pregnant outside marriage also received help. Finally, central government provided emergency shelter for those made homeless by war or natural disaster, and occasionally for newly arrived immigrants. Some private organisations, especially from the 1870s set up shelters for the unemployed in times of economic downturn, when fears of an "underclass" threatening social stability demanded action. The existence of slums and disease also forced government to act from the 1870s and in 1872 the Public Health Act was passed. It gave local authorities the power to regulate noxious industries, to have filthy houses cleansed and to encourage the installation of flush toilets. In 1886 authorities were given the power to limit overcrowding of houses. The system was not well administered and by the 1880s was all but defunct. Nonetheless, mortality rates amongst Pakeha did decline from the 1870s although there is debate over the reasons.

From the point of view of the government and the more wealthy town-dwellers those provisions may have eased some conditions and addressed the dangers of disease but they did not solve the problems of protecting the rural dream. During the 1880s and 1890s governments, and particularly the Liberal Government, began to readdress the problem of rural settlement. They did so in two ways: by easing the path to rural settlement and by trying to limit the influence of the urban under-class.

In 1886 John Ballance, the Minister of Lands, introduced a village settlement scheme which provided lands for rural "village" settlements and £20 grants for the building of houses. It was not popular, failing to solve the key problem for rural settlers of lack of capital for improvements.

From 1892 the Liberal Government passed a series of Lands for Settlement Acts which provided for Crown purchase (later compulsory purchase) of private lands. In 1894, the government passed the Government Advances to Settlers Act which allowed government to lend to rural settlers who owned land but had limited access to capital and were hampered by high interest rates. There was no hint of subsidy and interest rates were set above the initial borrowing rate. Only those who had shown thrift would receive assistance.

Debate about the passage of the bill centred on the issue of whether the government should intervene in the market and whether the Bill would undermine the principle of individual self-sufficiency and encourage dependency on the state. In the view of the politicians voting for the Bill, the monopolistic activities of money lenders and land speculators justified intervention - so long as there was to be no subsidy.

While this legislation opened up the possibility of further rural settlement and eased the way of many settlers, it did not offer an immediate solution to the problems of the towns. The casual workers were seen as undermining the resolve of the respectable workers to pursue the respectable life. This could only be avoided if these groups no longer lived side by side. The solution was two-fold: rid the towns of the lodging houses and common lodging houses used by this under-class and give the respectable worker access to the suburban life.

During the 1880s there was a concerted pressure from by local authorities for legislation that gave them the power to regulate boarding and lodging houses. It is no coincidence that the moves to regulate this type of accommodation emerged at a time of high unemployment. The government was beginning to pressure casual transient labour to conform to more respectable forms of behaviour and employment. But attempts to curb the more unruly lifestyles of the poor were of limited success. As a result there was a change of emphasis towards removing the respectable worker to a life in the suburbs. Once again the vision of the family and the suburb was used to promote and maintain stability.

In 1896, the government extended the Land for Settlements Act to include urban workers in a Workmens' Homes Scheme. This allowed for the buying of suburban lands for workmens' settlements - providing lots of up to 3 acres. Each worker could borrow £20 for fencing, planting and a house to be repaid at 5% interest over 10 years. The scheme was never promoted with great enthusiasm. Skilled urban workers themselves preferred to press for increased wages through the 1894 Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, rather than state intervention in housing.

Although they differed on the means both government and skilled workers saw the suburban life as a solution to their problems. Suburbs would undermine the economic basis for the slums and provide an opportunity for the "levelling up on the social scale" of the industrious worker most politicians saw as irrelevant arguments that the scheme did not directly help the urban poor.

During this period Maori were excluded from these initiatives. None of the policies developed involved any acknowledgement of what was suffered by them during this period. By the end of the century the expectation was that even if the Maori race survived, the future of Maori lay in the rural areas on the lands they had left.

However, the "mainstream" policies that were developed had a major influence on Maori and their housing experience. These influences are outlined below:

- **Assimilation:** The overarching theme of government policy in the 19th century was its role in assimilating Pakeha New Zealanders into a vision of, firstly, rural and then suburban life. Central to this was the place of the family. Governments were moved to act either to promote rural settlement or protect the respectable urban dweller by removing them from moral danger. They also tried to control and then eliminate the transient worker from urban life. By the end of the century, a "housing policy" was seen as a tool to be used by governments to promote a particular way of life. Access to resources depended on adopting a vision of the two generation family, of respectability and thrift. This assimilationist goal would last throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. As a consequence single Pakeha and unmarried Pakeha women with children were excluded from state resources for housing in any numbers until the 1970s. Maori would be doubly affected by an expectation that they embrace a European way of life if they were to gain access to housing assistance.

- **Rejection of Subsidy:** The emphasis on the individual and individual endeavour meant that there was strong opposition to the notion of subsidising the able-bodied. Between 1840 and 1958 when the first subsidised interest rates were introduced for state lending all mainstream lending was carried out on a cost recovery basis. This principle, established in the 19th century was to have a major impact on the access of the poor and unskilled workers, both Pakeha and Maori to housing.

For Maori, again the situation was made even more difficult because of their limited access to wage work during the 19th and early 20th century. The generally lower incomes meant that as a group they would be less likely to gain access.

- **Deserving and Undeserving Poor / Charitable Aid:** The distinction made between the deserving and undeserving poor in the 19th century carried over into the 20th century albeit with some tempering of the meagre relief systems available. Various governments subscribed to the view that the very poor would benefit from the trickle down effects of delivering better housing to the ordinary worker who was able to afford government interest rate sand rents. The notion of providing housing as welfare assistance to the poor developed outside this mainstream process.

Interestingly, the first welfare housing policy was introduced in 1938 in the Native Housing Amendment Act. This will be discussed below. The key issue here is that the separation of a "welfare function" from mainstream state resources meant that for many years Maori received housing help on the basis of need quite separately from the issue of access to mainstream government housing resources. The result was a confused system where during the 1940s and 1950s Maori applicants for state resources found it difficult to find their way through the bureaucratic maze.

2.2 Nineteenth Century Policies for Maori

Maori were effectively excluded from what little state resources there were available to improve housing during the nineteenth century. Maori were considered to have their own land base, capable of supporting the population, especially the population of what, to many, was considered to be a "dying race".

State support for the dream of rural settlement by new immigrants involved direct state involvement in ensuring that sufficient land was made available for settlement. Iwi signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 believing that it could give force and form to their own vision of a future with new settlers. It involved a view that would have seen the retention of the existing system of use rights, common ownership and occupancy rights over land which existed amongst iwi and hapu at the time.

However from the settler point of view, the release of land was essential to the pursuit of the rural dream. Essential too, was a system of property rights brought from England which protected the individual's undisturbed ownership and use of the land. The extinguishing of Maori principles of land occupation and usage were essential to the process of gaining access to land.

War and confiscation led to the availability of lands in certain parts of the North Island, in particular, but it was considered insufficient, especially in the face of major influxes of immigrants from the late 1860s. Land acquisition without recourse to war or confiscation required the undermining of Maori cultural systems.

The 1862 Native Lands Act which set up the Native Land Court, was central to this process. It was noted by one commentator at the time, that the primary purpose of the legislation was the buying in of lands but the other was the "detrification" of Maori society and the destruction of the "principle of communism".¹ It was this loss of land in the nineteenth century and during the early twentieth century which would have the most profound impact on Maori access to housing resources. This wider assimilation of Maori into European land ownership systems effectively destroyed the land base of many iwi and hapu and barred them from any resources that might be expected to have from land ownership. The leasing of remaining lands for peppercorn rentals to settlers was a further aspect of this alienation process.

A further outcome of this process of undermining of Maori land titles was the refusal of both the state and financial institutions to lend on anything but individualised title. Consequently, there was a lack of resources to carry out capital improvements including the building of good housing; this would be a major problem for Maori until well into the 1980s. Only in 1984 would government recognise the need to provide for lending for housing against Maori titles.

During the nineteenth century an expensive and demoralising process of litigation evolved around land sales and confiscations. This compounded the effects of loss of land and lack of capital to carry out improvements. Traditional systems of house building depended on the availability of labour and materials broke down with the loss of land and population decline.

¹ H. Sewell, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. 9, 1870, p.361

Access to capital then became the key for many to improve their housing conditions - a problem that few could overcome. By the end of the century many Maori, most of who lived outside the towns lived in poverty and abysmal housing conditions. Mortality rates were high according to eyewitness accounts although there are no recorded official figures. The Maori population is estimated to have declined from 100-120,000 in 1840 to 40,000 in 1895.²

If Maori were not to have access to state resources for housing and development - indeed they were to be the source of land for rural settlement - did they have access to any resources to alleviate their undoubted poverty and distress? The answer, as it was for the Pakeha poor and destitute, depended on the particular conditions and attitudes of officials at the time.

Central government and local support of the destitute was usually provided in the towns - in the firm belief that rural poverty was but a temporary state in the pioneering life. It was confined in theory to the support of those unable to support themselves. Able-bodied Maori would have been excluded on the same basis as able-bodied Pakeha; those theoretically eligible for help would have been excluded because most would have lived in the rural areas. Just as the government was wary of encouraging the dependency of the able-bodied on charity it was fearful of attracting Maori to the towns. The racism of many town dwellers also discouraged Maori from settling there, even if ties to the land had not kept them in the rural areas.

Assistance for destitute Maori was extremely limited. In the 1850s government funded hospitals were available to help with illness and, occasionally, shelter. Government officials did provide relief on an ad hoc basis and with the formalisation of relief during the 1870s and 1880s it is likely that older destitute Maori living in the towns with no obvious means of family support would have received some help. The only form of shelter provided for during the period was a system of hostels for transient Maori visiting the towns. As noted earlier, Maori were discouraged from town living; this was to remain policy until after the Second World War when Maori were actively encouraged to urbanise. The first hostels were intended for Maori and poor Pakeha but from the early years were used almost exclusively by Maori. Lodging and boarding-house keepers frequently refused to accept Maori and by the late nineteenth century these hostels often provided the only accommodation in the towns. The hostels were paid for out of endowments of reserves that could be leased out for grazing; there was to be no call on the general government reserves. This was to be a theme of later years as governments resisted the idea of housing assistance or shelter for what it saw as able-bodied, Maori who, more properly, should be settled on their remaining rural lands.

² D.I. Pool, *The Maori Population of New Zealand, 1769 - 1971*, Auckland, 1977, pp234-6

The experiments with mainstream housing policy in the late nineteenth century again did not extend to Maori and there was to be no specific consideration of Maori conditions when the legislation was drawn up. The solution to the increasing ills of Maori settlements in the rural areas was considered to lie with Maori themselves. By the late 19th century, in response to the conditions, there was growing national expression of resistance to land sales through the Kotahitanga movement which built on the resistance of tribal confederations, iwi and hapu that had been in existence throughout the previous decades. Parallel to the growth of this movement was the emergence of Maori reformers who took particular interest in the improvement of conditions in the villages. They began to press for reforms through government institutions and to build up a base of involvement in rural areas. Great emphasis was placed on public health reforms, along with housing improvements in the kainga.

In response to pressures from men such as Apirana Ngata and Maui Pomare, the Liberal government introduced the Maori Councils Act in 1900. Ngata and Cabinet Minister, James Carroll, were closely involved in the passage of the Act although one interpretation of the legislation was that the government was attempting to set up alternative institutions within the various villages to counter the growing influence of Maori reformers.

Whatever the motives of the legislation it attempted to set up local Maori Councils with powers similar to local authorities. The Councils could pass bylaws and draw up sanitary regulations for buildings and water supplies. Some improvements were made and between 1905 and 1909 1,256 houses were demolished and 2,103 new ones built, with 1,003 having toilets installed. Only half of the new houses were serviced with water, drainage or toilets. Although the new houses undoubtedly meant improved housing conditions for the recipients - compared with the often decayed, rotten structures of the villages they were not being built to the same standards as those being insisted upon for the new suburban dwellers.

All the improvements were paid for by Maori and the government released virtually no funds for improvements. In 1900 the Public Health Department had been created with a Maori Health section but in 1906, for example only £3,000 was set aside for Maori health. These various initiatives were driven by Maori, with the help of some sympathetic government officials, notably within the new Health Department. Housing policy as such was not part of the reform process although it was clearly recognised that housing improvements were a necessary part of the whole package. However, the direction taken by Ngata in particular in encouraging housing improvements in the villages is interesting as the first in a number of debates about what level of housing improvements should be delivered to the Maori people.

By 1912, 24 Councils had been created but by 1908 the scheme was already in decline. People had been reluctant to build houses for fear that if land was partitioned they would lose the house and reluctance to use water flush toilets was also widespread. Hapu were also reluctant to obey bylaws that had been written by others while in some areas tribal leaders had developed their own system of improvements - notably in the Waikato, the Ureweras at places such as Maungapohatu and in Taranaki. By 1910 most Councils were inactive and by 1911 the Health Department had been relieved of its responsibility for Maori health. The system of native sanitary inspectors were disbanded by 1912. The brief appearance of a Maori health section with the Health Department and the similarly brief flourishing of the Maori Councils and the village improvements was the first specific acknowledgement by government of the need to take action to address the living conditions of Maori.

In addition, government was reluctant to open up Maori access to the meagre welfare agencies of the period. In theory the Native Department had the responsibility for Maori welfare and the duplication of effort was to be avoided. This ostensible responsibility of the Native Department and later the Department of Maori Affairs for Maori welfare was to create confusion and parallel processes in the delivery of housing resources from the 1940s which were not always to the benefit of Maori needing housing assistance - although the potential for specific targeted housing assistance was always there. The ambiguity of the Native Department's role in the assimilation of Maori institutions in the nineteenth century was to continue through into the twentieth century in the area of housing policy.

The reality was that the government did not see that it had a direct role in the improvement of Maori housing or housing generally in the nineteenth century. For Maori, the initiatives and resources were to come from the community itself - the government's role was to pass legislation that established a framework for reformers to try and effect change.

The result was that in a situation where people had little or no capital, trade offs had to be made between some improvements for a wider group or a high level of improvements for a limited group. This dilemma was to continue for many communities well into the 1950s. The down-grading of housing solutions for Maori was to be deplored by the mainstream housing agencies from the 1940s particularly where those houses were to be built within the urban area. A key concern of the agencies was the impacts on the surrounding suburbs.

Ngata and Pomare accepted a trade-off between provision of full services. In 1905 Pomare noted in his report as Medical Officer for Maori Health for the Public Health Department, that ... "In many instances the Maoris have been too poor to build European houses, and I instructed our Sanitary Inspectors to see that better raupo or wiwi whares were built instead of their old ones, waiting the time when they could put up better cottages."

The assumption that European-style housing was inherently better than traditional Maori housing was never questioned. The result was the gradual entrenchment of a particular type of housing and settlement design policies for Maori. The detached suburban home became the model when resources were released by the state for use by Maori people over the next seventy years.

Section 3 : 1900 - 1935

By 1900 the key principles of mainstream housing policy had been established. The years between 1900 and 1930 were a time of experimentation with the way housing was to be delivered to respectable urban workers and their families. Nonetheless, the question of whether the government should provide direct housing help to the poor became an increasingly contentious issue as housing conditions continued to deteriorate. But both Liberal and Reform governments remained convinced of the need to avoid subsidy; skilled workers were also wary of subsidised housing - at least in the early years of the century.

Policies initially intended to "save" respectable workers and their families from the effects of the casual poor also became even more explicitly assimilationist while by the 1920s the suburban home was to become clearly associated in the minds of Reform politicians with home ownership. This would of course place the possibility of mainstream housing assistance even further from the reach of Maori people. The double barrier of "respectability" (i.e. living in the European way) and the ability to mortgage land to obtain a loan effectively excluded most Maori.

However, during this time Maori were more interested in the possibility of access to capital for land development through the Advances to Settlers Act. Housing policy would have more far-reaching implications during the 1940s and beyond. The following section traces the development of "mainstream" housing policies through the Government Advances Office and then traces the growth of a specifically Maori policy around the land development initiatives of the 1920s.

3.1 Mainstream Housing

By 1900 it had become obvious that the Workmens' Homes schemes were not going to solve the problems of the urban worker - insufficient land and resources had been set aside. Urban workers were reluctant to commit themselves to the suburban life which for all its pleasantness meant extra travel to the towns for work and more work at the end of the day. Workers put their faith in improved wages through the industrial arbitration system. In the towns themselves housing problems worsened. The threat of bubonic plague in 1900 brought the passage of new legislation - the Bubonic Plague Prevention Bill, the Public Health Act and the Municipal Corporations Act. Under the Public Health Act the Department of Health was created with specific powers to require demolition of unsanitary houses and to take action against infectious diseases.

The Act also gave the Department of Public Health the power to enact minimum building standards. The Municipal Corporation Act gave local authorities power to control the space around buildings to draw up controls on the amount of cubic air space in bedrooms and living rooms, and to stipulate the number of people allowed to occupy bedrooms. It also allowed for the demolition of slums and their replacement with parks and open areas.

The Public Health Act and the Municipal Corporations Act together can be seen as the Liberal Government's attempt to become involved in "town planning" and the beautification of the towns. They also grew out of both the public health reform movement which had been pushing vainly for action in the towns since the 1870s the 'City Beautiful' movement whose members were interested in beautification and civic improvement. Many of the ideas had been inherited from the United States where the movement played a major role in the removal of central city 'slums' and their replacement with parks. The development of this movement and the enshrinement of many of its ideas in statute and its eventual development into the town planning legislation of 1926 is of significance when considering issues of Maori housing.

The relationship between housing policy and town planning legislation and practice was always closely intertwined from the 1920s and was to become even more so in the 1950s and 1960s as governments intervened in housing to influence the shape and nature of New Zealand towns and cities. Implicit in the ideas underpinning town-planning practice was assumptions about the "twilight areas' of the central city, about the separation of home and work and the setting of housing and neighbourhood design standards which treated the nuclear family as the norm. Town planning practice underpinned the assimilationist housing policies of the 1940s to 1970s - influencing how and where not only Maori were housed but also single people and solo parents.

However, the Municipal Corporation Act also had clauses which provided for the construction of public housing for the first time by local authorities. Again the provisions were there not to provide housing for the very poorest urban dwellers but for the casual and unskilled workers for whom the suburban land and housing intended for the respectable skilled worker was too expensive and too far from town. The destitute in the worst slums were still to be serviced by indoor and outdoor relief. The legislation did recognise the needs of the casual unskilled worker in the provision for lodging houses; this was to be the only time until the 1980s that this kind of housing need was recognised. The basic pressure for protection of workers from 'moral pollution' and potential social disorder, still influenced policy. Now this was to be done through the construction of model housing in the towns themselves rather than through removal of workers to the suburbs.

From the first, there were a small number of Maori living semi-permanently in the main towns. This was revealed during the 1918 Influenza Epidemic when health officers reported that there were pockets of Maori, Indian and Chinese residents in the worst housing in places such as Grey Street in Auckland, and Cuba Street in Wellington. The Maori death rate in these areas during the epidemic has recently been estimated at 42.3 per 1,000 seven times that for the non-Maori population.³ The emphasis on slum removal meant that the few Maori urban dwellers were vulnerable to eviction and homelessness. This was to be a theme of the 1940s and 1950s when "slum" clearance in Auckland raised the major question of where the displaced - many of them Maori - were to be housed.

The legislation was also the first step in the codification of the family home as the legal norm in the planning of towns. Alternatives were to become exceptions to the rule - achievable only after persuasion of the authorities. This was to be a key issue for Maori as they became increasingly urbanised after World War II - the establishment of Maori forms of settlement within urban areas was to be problematic, requiring considerable time to be spent battling planning controls.

The municipal housing scheme failed - from lack of interest amongst local authorities and also because neither central or local government were willing to consider the possibility of either subsidised construction or subsidised rents. Although skilled and unskilled workers began to press for subsidised public housing as the arbitration system began to tighten up on wage increases, the government continued to reject such an approach. It turned instead to various forms of state funded or state built housing, which were to be let, sold or leased at a full cost recovery.

In 1905 the Workers Dwellings Act was passed by the Liberal Government. This provided for the state to commission the design and construction of houses on Crown land for lease or sale. The Act was again the occasion of major debate about the question of subsidy and even more contentious debates about the merits of freehold and leasehold. A series of amendments to the Act eventually sided with freehold with the government providing for the purchase of the houses. Not only did the scheme finally favour freehold but in 1906 it was overtaken by the Government Advances to Workers Act which provided for the lending of money to workers for the construction of a dwelling on a similar basis as the Advances to Settlers legislation of 1894.

³ *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Influenza Epidemic*, National Archives, H 3/1, box 2; G. Rice, *Black November: The 1918 Influenza Epidemic in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1988, p.102

The passage of the Advances to Workers legislation has been interpreted as being a response by the Liberal Government to growing restlessness of urban workers. Another view sees it as a victory of freehold interest over the leasehold interests of the Liberal Government. Whatever the interpretation, both the Workers Dwellings Act and the Advances to Workers Acts were a reaffirmation and of the targeting of resources to skilled and semi-skilled workers of suburban housing. The debates saw a return to the question of the safety of the respectable worker and the vulnerability of the family. Considerable emphasis was placed on respectability, as evidenced by thrift and marriage. While some workers dwellings and some advances went to women with dependent children this was an exception, and generally, the housing went to men with wives and children.

The Advances to Workers programme quickly became popular but by the beginning of World War I lending had all but ceased. Housing conditions during the period also continued to decline. Although there was an increase in the number of two and three bedroom homes and a reduction in the number of tenements there was a serious problem emerging in the central parts of the cities of overcrowding, of derelict housing, little or no water supply and a failed waste management system. These areas were highly vulnerable to disease and in late 1918 when the Influenza Epidemic struck these areas were immediately and disastrously affected.

A panicked government - also confronted by the need to house returning soldiers began to readdress a housing problem it had ignored for four to five years. In 1919 it passed the Housing Act which picked up the early ideas of the Workers Dwellings Act and proceeded to try and reinvigorate a building industry in serious decline. At the same time town planning reformers advocated town planning legislation which would allow reformers the issues of the central city to be addressed. Although some groups, including some women's organisations and pressed for communal housing the legislation was to emphasise the need to provide for high quality suburban environments. One of the results of this reform movement was the design of the Orakei Garden Suburb which was to form the basis of the first Labour government's state housing programme in Auckland. The impacts on Ngati Whatua o Orakei have been well documented.

These initiatives, along with the government's Discharged Soldiers Scheme to settle returned soldiers on rural farms, were to pale into significance against the Reform government's decision in 1922 to down grade direct involvement in housing construction and to reactivate the Advances to Workers legislation under the new State Advances office. The Massey government placed its faith in home ownership and for the first time began to explicitly promote home ownership as an insurance against social disorder. This was given urgency by the events in 1917 in Russia and the continuing unrest in many parts of Europe.

Now under the Massey government, the links had finally been made between

the suburban life, the family and respectability, and home ownership. This was to remain a theme of governments in New Zealand until the 1980s. The old emphasis on thrift and worthiness was still to continue. The Liberal government had always refused to advance more than approximately 75% of the value of the property - under either the Advances to Settlers or Advances to Workers Acts. Initially, this stemmed from a fear of excessive government indebtedness - the legacy of the heavy borrowing by governments in the 1870s and 1880s. Later this would evolve into the view that proof of worthiness to receive government aid was the ability to save the remainder of the money to purchase a house or land. This was especially true of the Advances to Workers Act where saving the deposit was proof of thrift and therefore respectability. Although Massey was prepared to lend up to 95% on new housing the 5% was often a significant issue for many.

This final linking of all three factors would have major implications for Maori from the 1950s. While public housing would ensure good quality shelter, stability and security, home ownership was perceived as a source of wealth and advancement. Until the late 1950s and the introduction of low-interest 3% loans few Maori gained access to mainstream lending. The ability to save the deposit was always to be a major factor in deciding who gained access to state resources. Although ostensibly non-discriminatory - in practice many Maori would be excluded from mainstream housing and forced to rely on state housing or lending through the Department of Maori Affairs.

The emphasis on state lending rather than direct housing construction that emerged in the 1920s was not just intended to place the family at the heart of state policy. After the war, the government and manufacturing interests had realised the significance of demand for housing in stimulating the construction and manufacturing industry. The government became closely involved in experimentation with building materials and construction techniques. Again for Maori, this link between home ownership, family housing, urban development and manufacturing interests would have implications in later years.

During the 1940s and through to the 1970s an almost symbiotic relationship emerged between government policy and industry interests. The building industry became heavily involved in the delivery of two and three bedroom urban houses and was both unwilling and incapable of delivering alternative forms, and certainly of constructing such housing in rural areas. As a result the Department of Maori Affairs was to become one of the few agencies able and willing to build in remote rural areas. Even so, the houses built were usually larger versions of standard house designs used for mainstream policies.

As the government expanded its state lending policies it held fast to the principle of cost recovery and to the view that the state had a role in welfare relief only as it applied to the deserving poor. Those elderly unable to fend for themselves and the ill. The able-bodied indigent theoretically able to look

after themselves were not to receive state assistance. Indeed the state began to examine its role in these areas closely.

In particular, government began to look at the way it was caring for the elderly. During the 1920s legislation was passed that built on the old indoor relief system of refuges and rest homes for older people. However, there were subtle changes. State resources were focused on the destitute elderly unable physically or mentally to care for themselves. Administrators gradually excluded from their homes the able-bodied who might have little or no income but were expected to live in rental housing or with their families. The Rest Homes Act was passed which set up a system of private rest homes to take responsibility for the destitute and infirm elderly - paid for by a subsidy through the Charitable Aid Boards.

However, from the late 1920s the casual poor and the destitute reliant on outdoor and occasionally indoor relief were joined by a stream of unemployed cast out of work by the world wide economic depression. Where people could no longer pay their rents, promotion and maintenance of home ownership became secondary to the governments desire for retrenchment. State lending was to all but cease and the State Advances office was to foreclose on some mortgages.

The increase in unemployment put the charitable aid system under stress and by 1931 nearly half had overspent their budget. In 1930 work schemes have been set up but by mid 1931 the Unemployment Board was requiring men to stand down one week in four. Single men were discouraged from applying for relief while indoor relief continued for a number of years to be kept for the elderly and the ill. Single women were also excluded - either from unemployment relief payments or from work schemes.

Eventually, the extraordinary events of the depression and pressure from church and private relief agencies forced the charitable aid boards to provide some shelter for the increasing number of homeless single men and to improve relief payments and work schemes.

Despite the depression the approach of government was to adhere closely to the distinction between deserving and undeserving, as a basis of relief. The distaste for direct intervention in housing provision for the very poor continued. By contrast, the lines between the respectable and thrifty workers worthy of access to state resources for housing and the able-bodied casual worker was to become more blurred as a result of the depression. As both the United government and the Labour government struggled to come to terms with the housing problems of the 1930s the problem of reconciling the desire for cost-recovery with the notion of respectability and worth became highly problematic.

Implications of mainstream housing policy for Maori.

- ⇒ the family home in a suburban context became increasingly entrenched through health and town-planning legislation and building standards as the "norm" for settlement. This would provide a context which was at odds with Maori settlement patterns.
- ⇒ Lending policies moved from emphasis on the suburban family home to include an increasing emphasis on home ownership, coupled with a growing preference for respectable urban workers. Access to housing therefore became dependent both on a particular way of life and on the ability to save a deposit for a mortgage application.
- ⇒ Central parts of the main towns became the focus of interest for public health reformers and "city beautifiers". Maori residents, particularly from the 1940s would become increasingly vulnerable to calls for urban renewal in these areas.
- ⇒ The refusal of governments to become involved in direct housing support for the able-bodied destitute meant that the able-bodied poor and casual workers was ineligible for any housing support. Many Maori would fall into this gap.
- ⇒ The growing relationship between government housing policy and industry meant that the industry was unwilling and increasingly unable to be likely to deliver appropriate housing to Maori. This would become a major issue in the 1950s.

3.2 Maori Access to Housing Resources: 1900-1935

During the 1920s and 1930s government housing assistance was split into two quite distinct schemes - one focusing on rural settlement, the other on housing the skilled or semi-skilled urban worker. The governments refusal to address the problems of the destitute - except through a minimum income for some old age pensioners and groups such as widows - meant that there was little direct access to housing resources for poor Maori. The fact that many Maori, although destitute in terms of income or possessions still had interests in land in rural areas would have made them automatically ineligible even if assistance was extended to the able-bodied poor.

There were few Maori who would have been eligible for assistance under the Advances to Workers or Workers' Dwellings schemes. Those who were urban dwellers would have rarely earned enough to afford the rents or loan repayment rates. This was also the case for Maori living in rural areas who might have applied for resources through the Advances to Settlers

programme. Even more restrictive was the need to be in possession of land that was in single title: the Government Advances Office would not lend on anything else. Finally, any applicant, Maori or Pakeha had to prove themselves sufficiently respectable and willing to live a stable family life. For officials, this meant that any Maori must abandon the "Maori way" and adopt European attitudes. What living in the European way meant was often unclear, but it involved a clear rejection of extended family life and connections.

Ineligibility for urban housing resources was less an issue for Maori at the time than the problems of gaining access to capital advances for improvements to rural lands. Maori were not excluded from the Advances to Settlers schemes and there are indications that some Maori did take up loans under the scheme. In 1914 Maui Pomare, now MP for Western Maori, requested information on the number of Maori recipients of Settlers loans. He was told that between 1910 and 1914 88 Maori had received loans and in 1922 he was told that over the previous 10 years 57 Maori had been recipients.⁴ It is not possible to know what proportion of Maori applicants had been successful or whether there had been lending prior to 1910. But undoubtedly the small numbers would reflect the barriers to many Maori gaining access: poverty, the need to individualise land titles and the need to live in some proven way as a European.

This latter factor was undoubtedly assimilationist. But while there were some government officials who saw the connection of this requirement with wider notions of assimilation of Maori into the European world there was no explicit stated policy direction that directed officials to use access to housing resources to achieve such a result. That assimilation was intended is indisputable but it was assimilation of all groups, Maori, single men and women, the transient and the casual worker into a vision of family, home and social stability. Maori were caught up in this wider vision.

The only other assistance Maori received from main stream policy was through the various schemes introduced from the 1930s to provide support for the unemployed - schemes usually associated with public works. Maori were eligible for assistance but usually received lower payments - on the grounds that the standard of living that had to be maintained was lower.

Although, technically, Maori could gain access to some housing resources, the reality was that few were eligible financially and that they had to conform to European notions of family life. Government still adhered to the principle that there should be no special scheme for Maori housing - and certainly that any resources released to help should be generated from income off Maori land not through the consolidated fund. The alternative promoted by many Maori at the time and fostered by people such as Ngata, was a Maori land

⁴ Reply to an enquiry by Dr Maui Pomare as to the number of Maori receiving loans, 24 November 1914; Memo to Dr Pomare, 6 November 1922, National Archives, SAC 1, 9/24

development programme that would provide Maori with an economic base that would generate capital for general improvements in living conditions. Housing improvements were a part of, but incidental to, this vision of Maori economic independence.

The Reform government, particularly its younger politicians such as J G Coates, had become some what more sympathetic to this vision - particularly after the war and the effects of the epidemic. Between 1906 and 1921 however, a further 2.5 million hectares of Maori land was alienated. The result was that politicians began to fear that the shrinking amount of land would not be able to support what was now an increasing Maori population. By 1921, 57,000 Maori owned approximately 4.9 million acres - most of it of little commercial value. There was a fear, as there had been of the casual and transient poor in the late nineteenth century, that Maori people would flock to the towns and become a burden on the state.

From the 1920s the government began to heed Maori demands for rural economic development. The passage of the Native Trustee Act 1920 meant that from 1923 the Native Trustee could invest money from the Maori Land Board and income from Maori reserves in loans for land development. The 1929 United government approved lending on Maori land developments/schemes and the Native Land Claims Adjustment Act passed in the same year allowed the Minister of Native Affairs to designate areas suitable for land development irrespective of any problems over land titles. These were the first schemes that were designed to release capital to Maori landowners. Although assumptions were still made about lifestyle and matters of thrift etc they were less firmly fixed to notions of "European" living and were specifically intended to reinforce Maori settlement of their lands.

The land development schemes were only considered on land that had potential for commercial development. Waikato Maori, under the leadership of Te Puea Herangi, for example, seized the opportunity for development. In other areas where the leadership was not as strong and where the lands were less usable, such as in Northland, the King Country or Taranaki, few schemes were attempted.

By 1936, approximately 16% of Maori land had been gazetted for land development schemes while 40% of lands had some scheme being development on them (approximately 1,788 farms). Some 12% of the now 94,000 strong population occupied land being developed under the scheme. Undoubtedly there were improvements; between 1929 and 1936 551 houses were built as part of the schemes. But some criticised the fact that houses were often being built to a standard below that expected for Pakeha housing. The Public Works Department which built some of the houses was also doubtful about the standards and reserved the larger houses for Pakeha farm supervisors. This was the same dilemma that had been experienced at the turn of the century. Sir Apirana Ngata's priorities as Minister of Native Affairs between 1928 and 1934 continued to be with farming and land

development. He was prepared to limit the construction of houses and willing to accept lower standards. He was also wary of forcing Pakeha type housing onto people used to traditional forms of kainga housing. Nonetheless he continued to be an advocate of "European" housing standards.

In 1933 Dr H B Turbott, Medical Officer of Health on the East Coast, carried out a survey of housing conditions amongst Maori in the Waiapu District. Using 300m³ of air space as a standard (below the standard previously used by the Health Department) he found 60% of dwellings were overcrowded, 50% were using unsafe water supplies, 50% had pit toilets, 33% had no toilet, 13% had a sink and only 8% had a bath.⁵ In response to these conditions, and to general pressure to address the conditions revealed and exacerbated by the Depression the Coalition government, under J G Coates, passed the 1935 Native Housing Act. This Act empowered the Board of Maori Affairs to advance funds to build new housing or carry out improvements to existing housing; was the first legislation to recognise the particular housing problems and circumstances experienced by Maori. However, the same debates about the question of subsidy were raised as had occurred with the Workers Dwellings Act in 1905. The regulations were not promulgated until 1936 when it was finally decided to pursue cost recovery.

The Act used lending as the mechanism to help improve housing conditions amongst rural Maori. Undoubtedly there was racism amongst town dwellers and a resistance to the shift of Maori to the towns. Whether there was an inherent racism in the government's policies which sought to keep the two races is unclear. The government did see the future of Maori lying on their rural lands and Coates, in particular, had been strongly influenced by Ngata and his land development schemes. The fears of all past governments continued with a resistance to the idea of the destitute locating as an underclass in the towns.

The legislation was undoubtedly seen as a way of improving Maori health and of 'elevating' Maori, of leading them slowly to an "improved" way of life. It did not necessarily demand the Maori become Europeanised in order to receive assistance, or that they abandon the system of the extended family. Indeed the emphasis on rural housing in conjunction with the land development schemes would tend to suggest otherwise. It was the physical improvement in housing conditions that were intended to improve in a general sense. The emphasis on lending recognised that the Maori likely to use the Act were not landless but that they lacked capital for improvements. As such the Act was part of the tradition beginning with the 1894 Advances to Settlers Act.

The period between 1900 and 1935 is notable for the initial emphasis on the resourcing of solutions out of the land assets owned by Maori and the shift by 1935 to an acknowledgement that the state would have to intervene if housing

⁵ Dr H.B. Turbott 'Health and Social Welfare' in I.L.G. Sutherland (ed.), *The Maori People Today*, pp229-68

improvements were to occur. It is notable for the acknowledgement that housing was an urgent and pressing problem - irrespective of the land development schemes. Finally, the Act is notable in that by placing the responsibility for administering the Act under the Board of Maori Affairs and the Native Department it reinforced the notion that 'mainstream' state lending and state housing was to be reserved for those considered to be willing and able to conform to a particular, idealised, way of life. The native Housing Act 1935 was a welfare provision, to be administered separately from state lending and later state housing.

The following section discusses the development of the main features of Labour's housing policies and then goes on to summarise their implications for Maori. The final section then discusses the detailed development of a parallel Maori housing policy through the Department of Maori Affairs and how the two policies became closely interlinked.

4.1 Mainstream Policies

In June 1936, the Labour government passed the State Advances Act which placed the earlier Mortgage Corporation in public ownership. The Corporation's task, among other things, was to administer lending on housing and the country's state housing stock. The construction of the houses would be carried out by the Department of Housing Construction, later the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works.

The government's lending policy had two arms. Ordinary loans up to two-thirds of the security would be made available with no restriction on the amount lent. Special loans would be available in areas of acute housing shortage. The Minister of Finance, Walter Nash, was prepared to forego any upper limit on these loans but the State Advances Corporation chose only to lend up to 85% because of a perceived risk. Initially, Nash had also placed a £6 per week income limit (for couples) to try and target those groups unlikely to be lent money by the private sector. This was removed as the government became concerned that not enough houses were being built, but the State Advances Corporation still set limits on the amount lent. Interest rates were set by statute at $4\frac{1}{8}\%$ - above lending costs but still an unprecedentedly low rate.

The establishment of this lending function happened relatively quickly; the process for state housing was much more complex. In April 1936 Parliament passed the Reserve Bank of New Zealand Amendment Act which stipulated that the bank's role was amongst other things, to promote the 'economic and social welfare of New Zealand'. £5 million from the National Development Loan Account was released for state housing construction, to be paid back gradually at the rate of 1% interest.

Having established the legislative context Labour's main task was to reactivate the private sector and fashion it into an industry able to construct large numbers of good quality houses quickly. The decision was made not to attempt the construction of houses directly by the state although the government was to have direct involvement in the selection of designs, quantity surveying etc and was to set up a number of joinery factories to try and cut housing costs. This emphasis was to continue to cement the relationship between the private building sector and the State although there was to be considerable resentment after the war at the limitations kept on private building by the government.

The state houses built by the Labour government were distinctive - a deliberate departure from previous housing and an attempt to improve the quality of the country housing stock. The vast majority of houses built were three bedroom, detached dwellings each on its own section. The need to reduce construction costs did lead the government to build two storey semi-detached or row units but it tried hard to devise designs that looked like the standard suburban house.

Both the government's state lending and state housing were intended to indirectly benefit the very poor through the construction of an upgraded housing stock that would trickle down to those unable to buy their own home. State housing would rescue the respectable urban worker and his family from the atrocious conditions that set them alongside the poorest groups. The old ethos that underlay the New Zealand dream, the belief that the government should not provide charity or subsidy to the able-bodied, demanded that the government recover the cost of state housing.

The apparent harshness of the approach was tempered by Labour's introduction of the 1938 Social Security Act which guaranteed a universal superannuation benefit alongside the old age pension, and a series of means tested and targeted benefits. Briefly, before the introduction of the Social Security Act the Minister of Health had argued that it was a responsibility of the Hospitals and Charitable Aid Boards to house all "indigent" people - that is people without means of support, or provide money so that they could house themselves. However, this idea of a state responsibility for shelter as a "welfare" function was rejected in favour of an incomes policy. Labour did introduce and maintain rental control legislation throughout the period which was also intended to help those on the lowest incomes, but neither the guarantee of a minimum income or limits on rents were to improve conditions for those squeezed by a major housing shortage.

In 1937, the government decided that it would not subsidise individual state tenants. It set rents on the basis of the average capital cost of each type of state house plus an allowance for interest and maintenance costs; this meant rents might not bear any relation to surrounding private rentals. The Minister of Finance did have the power to adjust rents for poorer households but the State Advances Corporation opposed this and argued for poorer households to receive income supplements instead. The government believed that as more houses were built and as the construction industry became more streamlined costs would fall and therefore rents with them. Above all, by not subsidising rents the government could recover its investment so it could build more housing.

With this approach it made no difference who occupied state housing, but some critics pressed for the housing of the very poor living in the worst conditions. The government compromised by giving houses to those workers in the worst conditions - as long as they could afford to pay the rent. John A Lee, the Under-Secretary for Housing, opposed this targeting. As a matter of

principle, he believed that the houses should be made available to a broad spectrum - he wanted a socialised housing stock not just welfare housing for the poor. Like a number of his colleagues he was opposed to the concentration of the poor in suburbs - believing that the suburban life itself involved a process of levelling up of people to a new level of stability, social order and family life.

This was untenable for politicians confronted by demands from constituents living in appalling conditions, who resented that others in better conditions were receiving state housing. Late in 1937, the State Advances Corporation came up with a system of allocation committees made up of citizens who would allocate houses after the Corporation had carried out an assessment and awarded a number of points intended to be a measure of housing conditions. This system seemed the fairest, although the attitudes of the members of the allocation committees could have a major impact on decisions made.

However, the real problem encountered by Labour was that a political decision had been made to limit rents to that necessary to cover insurance and maintenance costs was causing discontent. In 1943, rents on state tenancies were fixed and the Corporation could only raise rents if tenants failed to fulfil the conditions of the tenancy. This was done at a time of inflationary pressures and the result was that government severely limited its room to manoeuvre at a time when interest rates on the National Development Loan Account were being raised. All sorts of anomalies crept in so that tenants who had taken up tenancies early on were paying considerably less than tenants who had enforced more recently. Most telling, moderate income workers were paying lower rents than those living in the private sector whose income might be lower. The government had created a favoured group of tenants who were not always in the greatest need.

At the same time the State Advances Corporation continued to be adamant about refusing to admit single people, the elderly and "disreputable" families to the mainstream housing stock. These groups were seen as challenging the primary purpose of state housing - the housing of the family.

During the fourteen years of Labour government a significant level of resources were released for housing - with the majority going to state housing. In that period the government built approximately 32,000 houses, about a quarter of the state houses ever built. If war had not occurred it is likely that these figures would have been higher.

From 1939 production of houses generally was to drop dramatically, to a lowest point in 1943. From that time the government increased production of state housing slowly while keeping a tight hold on the size, materials and quality of privately built housing. Despite the best efforts of the government during the late 1940s the housing conditions continued to worsen.

In 1943 priority was introduced for returned servicemen and their families. First they were to receive 23% and then 50% of all state houses available during this period and allocation was to be made via separate allocation committees. Similarly, special loans were made available - particularly for servicemen wanting to settle in areas unlikely to receive state housing. The amounts were never enough and by 1949 the shortage of housing along with the seeming anomalies in the state rental system were being promoted by the National Party as a nationwide disgrace. As an alternative to state housing National promoted home-ownership as the true goal of New Zealanders.

The continuation of transit camps set up for the homeless during the war also told against the government. In 1944 Auckland City Council had set up a transit camp at Western Springs. An agreement was reached between the State Advances Corporation and the Council that the former would house families who had lived in the camp for more than six months. It was soon became clear that many families would stay much longer than this and that they would have few chances of obtaining state housing. By 1945 the government, despite opposition from groups such as the unions, agreed to build more camps.

The camps were managed by local authorities and this led to a number of problems. The State Advances Corporation had its own lists of state house applicants and tried to insist that those people on its waiting lists were given temporary shelter in the camps. This would mean that the main users of the camps would be couples with young dependent children. The local authorities were less stringent and accepted other homeless but then found that the Corporation felt it had no obligation to house them. Drawn out arguments between local authorities and the Corporation were to make it very difficult for some groups to find good housing.

This general development of housing policy under the Labour government has the following implications for Maori:

⇒ the links between the family home, the suburbs and access to housing resources were to be stronger than ever. The period between 1930 and 1950 was notable for a number of key public servants who espoused a belief in the "planned" environment as a source of social improvement. Not only would the suburbs deliver stability and order but they would be the catalyst that would assimilate New Zealanders into a truly egalitarian way of life.

The suburbs were planned to avoid obvious difference or class. This was an elaboration of the old notion that emphasised the removal of the respectable worker to the suburb' now the suburb itself would actively mould New Zealand society.

Since the 1890s, reformers had seen the suburb as having an underlying purpose or function: to wean workers away from the

immoral life of the inner-city dweller. The garden city had originally sought to reduce friction between worker and capitalist by integrating work and home. These ideas were reworked into the idea of the classless suburb which would relieve social tension by the assimilation of various groups into an overall culture of family and home. This was the basis for John A Lee's opposition to the targeting of state housing.

At a time when Maori were beginning to gain access to housing resources this emphasis on the power of the "classless suburb" was to be a major barrier. For the notion of a "classless suburb" was, of course, a form of settlement purely European in concept and appearance; it demanded that there be no obvious differences or that if there were that they be scattered throughout. For to have concentration of particular social groups was to undermine the notion of New Zealand as an egalitarian society and question Government investment in a suburban future.

⇒ the realities of administering an unsubsidised state housing stock at a time of often extreme housing distress meant that in reality the government had to begin to address the issue of need as a basis for allocation of housing.

This did not mean that state housing had taken on a welfare function but it had created some cracks in the view that the government should avoid a direct responses to the housing problems of the poor. For Maori, despite the barriers created by the idea of a classless suburb these cracks were to lead eventually to increased access to mainstream resources.

4.2 Maori Housing: 1935 - 1950

The Native Affairs Department conducted surveys throughout New Zealand in 1937 as a parallel to the housing surveys conducted in the main towns. In places such as Turangi, for example, the figures confirmed Turbott's findings in 1933. The results of the 369 houses surveyed there were:

46%	no windows	4%	1-2 people per room
79%	defective roofing	15%	2-3 people per room
50%	no ventilation	80%	3+ people per room
72%	unlined walls		
77%	unlined ceilings		
24%	earth walls		
27%	unsound wooden floors		

The final figures were published in 1940. Of the Maori housing surveyed:

- 59% were overcrowded
- 36% were unfit - dark or damp
- 45% had unsafe water
- 44% had broadcast rubbish
- 33% in land development programme areas had broadcast faeces
- 62% in the "backward" areas had broadcast faeces
- 89% in the "worst areas" had broadcast faeces ⁶

These surveys were carried out mainly in rural areas. Although the general surveys would have picked up the worst conditions experienced by Maori in the towns the published figures made no distinction on the basis of race. However, accompanying comments by various town clerks noted the concentrations of Maori living in the worst areas.

The 1936 census figures also provided some insights. By the 1930s, 19% of people identifying themselves as being of Maori origin were living in urban areas. This is a significant number which led to increased concern that an under-class of urban, now Maori, poor was being created in the towns. Census figures also provided a general summary of conditions:

Housing Type	Maori	Non-Maori
House	52.8	86.5
Flat	-	3.6
Bach/Hut	33.9	4.2
Temporary	11.0	2.9
Other	2.3	2.3

The occupancy rate of the two groups was as follows:

	Maori	Non-Maori
1 person/room	28.0	83.3
2+3	48.4	1.5
3+	28.3	0.2

Although none of this information would have been published at the time that the regulations to the 1935 Native Housing Act were drawn up the problems were well known. The regulations were gazetted in January 1937; under them the Board of Maori Affairs rejected any hint of subsidy requiring that interest

⁶ All following figures in this section are obtained from M. Krivan, *The Department of Maori Affairs Housing programme, 1935-1967*, Massey University MA Thesis, 1991

be charged at rate that covered finance costs ($4\frac{1}{2}\%$). The loan would be secured against the land - which meant that only that land occupied under a single certificate of title would be eligible for a loan. The owners would have to be in long term employment and an 8-10% deposit would be required. The maximum amount that could be lent was £750 (State Advances Corporation lent up to £1,000 at the same time). The only concession was the maximum of a 10% deposit; the Corporation's special loans required up to 15%.

There had been considerable debate in Cabinet about whether the scheme would be run on a cost-recovery basis; the Board of Maori Affairs strongly opposed subsidy and this was the route that was finally adopted. The money from the scheme was to come from the Maori Land Scheme vote, with £100,000 being voted in 1937/38. The Public Works Department provided housing designs while groups such as unemployed Maori men built the houses through the Employment Promotion fund.

The scheme was always starved of funds, while the entry costs were high. Under-funded and expensive it reached few Maori. If Cabinet had stood firm this would have been the country's first subsidised housing programme; as it was, it soon became clear that the scheme was not successful.

In 1938 an amendment to the Native Housing Act was passed which provided for the funding of "indigent" Maori - that is, landless Maori who had nothing to offer as security for a loan and for whom the normal scheme would be beyond their ability to repay. The Board of Maori Affairs could now forego repayment in necessitous cases. The scheme apparently included Maori wage-workers who, although not technically "indigent" because they had a source of support, earned so little that they could not expect to obtain adequate housing. The Board could also build houses for sale, or for lease on a weekly or monthly basis. Repayments and rents were set by the Board and often occupants would pay virtually nothing but there was a tendency to favour those who could afford to help themselves.

The funding of the scheme was again minimal. In the first year £100,000 was set aside plus one third of the Native Trustee's fund. In 1941, this was appropriated to the Consolidated Fund and in the end the Trustee funds were not used. Again the Cabinet had been happy to recoup only the interest on this Special fund but the Board insisted that the principle be recovered. A £25 deposit was still required (except for those on a pension) and the remainder would be repaid over 20 years. The loans, however, would be interest free.

In 1939 the Under-secretary of Maori Affairs had identified that £4.6 million was needed to house Maori adequately. But in the period between 1938-1940 a total of total of £228,852 was set aside for Maori housing with only £134,682 spent on 635 loans. In comparison, in this period 5,857 loans from the State Advances Corporation cost £5.2 million.

The Labour government still subscribed to the view that housing conditions

would be improved through a general improvement to a housing stock made available to moderate income New Zealanders. It acknowledged a need to address the specific housing problems of poor and/or rural Maori with special schemes but these were incidental to its wider purpose. Undoubtedly housing conditions did improve dramatically over the next 14 years although there were still severe shortages by 1949. However, most Maori were excluded from these direct improvements.

Maori leaders were not impressed with the Labour government's efforts. In 1938 the Labour Party's Maori Committee called a national conference which recommended that the responsibility for Maori housing conditions be moved from the Native Department to the Housing Construction Branch. The reluctance of the Board to forego the recovery of costs and the even greater reluctance of the Native Department to develop a role as a landlord was seen as impending solutions. The result would have been the merging of Maori housing with mainstream policy but this was resisted by the State Advances Corporation; it opposed the mixing of potentially welfare policies with policies intended to promote an improved housing stock and the suburban life. And although it was possible for it to see individual Maori adopting a "European lifestyle", the Corporation was less convinced that this would happen in large numbers. The presence of Maori in the suburban dream was seen as much a threat as the casual and transient poor had been perceived to be some 40-50 years before.

In 1939, Paddy Webb, Minister of Labour, called a conference entitled "Employment and Housing of Maori", of MPs and officials. Webb, as were others, was becoming aware of the slow shift of Maori to the towns and the growing need for labour as a result of growth in the manufacturing industry. There was an ambivalence, however, about the presence of an urban Maori population and considerable emphasis was still placed in the conference on rural housing.

At the Conference, Ngata looked for changes to the Native Housing Act - such as the Board of Maori Affairs buying up dwellings and sites for dwellings and leasing them to Maori. This would solve the need for security. Others such as E Tirikatene, the MP for Southern Maori objected in principle to the scheme on the grounds that what was required for Maori was fundamentally unfair. "Pakehas could go into the state houses being built throughout New Zealand but the Maori could get no houses unless he had security."

The MP for Northern Maori, P K Paikea argued for a specific Native Housing Department similar to the Housing Construction Department. This, he felt, would avoid the messy system of construction cobbled together between the Public Works Department, the Native Department and the various unemployment schemes. This was rejected and it was not until the 1950s that the Maori Affairs Department was able to deliver an efficient construction division. In effect, Paikea was looking for a Maori state housing programme - presumably one that could deliver to rural as well as urban Maori. It is not

clear whether such a scheme was intended for landless Maori or to provide rental housing on land owned by Maori as well.

Arthur Tyndall, Director of Housing Construction, questioned whether Maori could afford the rents that would be charged for a cost-recovery programme while H T Armstrong, the Minister of Housing suggested that increases in income subsidy through family allowances paid to Maori would help. In fact, it was Arthur Tyndall who raised the possibility of direct subsidy of rents; he had always felt torn between the need for cost-recovery and the plight of those too poor to pay the higher rents.

Maori housing under the Native Housing Act was seen as an exception to mainstream policy; a position easy to adopt given the emphasis on rural housing as opposed to the urban emphasis of the state housing and lending programmes. However, the state housing programme, in particular, was not immune from pressures to address the immediate problems of the poor, as was shown in the previous section. The government had already been forced to adopt a pensioner housing scheme for the elderly which in effect was subsidised. With its focus on "welfare" issues the pensioner scheme was also seen as separate from mainstream policy.

The 1935 Native Housing Act and its 1938 Amendment delivered only a limited number of houses during the period: the figures are set out below:

Maori Housing Delivered Through the Native Department			
Year	New	Additions	Purchased
1936	116*		-
1937	185*		-
1938	228	8	4
1939	448		12
1940	471		10
1941	425		6
1942	148		11
1943	85		14
1944	86		17
1945	97		28

*Maori Land Development Scheme

The Board of Maori Affairs cost recovery programme meant that the quality of houses delivered were well below those expected for Pakeha. "Baths, sinks, sewerage, hot water supplies and ranges [were cut out] in that order". This

reduction of quality by the Native Department was criticised by the Health and Public Works Department at the time.

The issue of whether equal standards should be delivered became contentious during the period. In 1944 loan limits were increased to £1,000 which allowed for greater expenditure on each house but it was still below the £1,250 and £1,500 limits of the State Advances Corporation and Rehabilitation Department respectively. The latter was responsible for the rehabilitation of returning soldiers - (including Maori soldiers).

Tirikatene believed in the delivery of the same standard to Maori while Ngata had of course argued for a reduced standard to avoid debt. Whatever the decision there is no doubt that the quality of housing and the issue of equal treatment was seen influencing assimilation. Improved conditions were seen as leading Maori to becoming more open to adopting Pakeha ways of living. However, the notion that housing resources could be used to deliberately assimilate Maori was still not clearly articulated - there was still considerable conflict between the old view that housing resources were there to save and reward the individual and the potential that some saw of absorbing the intransigent and forcing them to emulate the life of the suburban dweller.

In the late 1940s the Board of Maori Affairs began to explore group housing programmes whereby it would attempt comprehensive development schemes in response to the availability of land and sufficient capital. In 1948, supplementary interest free loans were introduced for indigent Maori where repayments were calculated according to the ability to repay and impacts on the applicants standard of living. If there was difficulty their interest free loan could be used - with payments increasing when wages increased. These changes allowed the Department to improve the quality and size of houses.

In 1947 the Maori Affairs Department had also been given the right to set loan limits equal to those set by the State Advances Corporation. The cost recovery principle was also tempered when the Board of Maori Affairs delegated loans approval to the Under-secretary of Maori Affairs - T T Ropiha. While initially Labour had not addressed the question of equal quality, by the late 1940s the principle had been adopted. The result was some improvement to housing conditions. Some indicators are set out below:

Housing Type				
	1945		1951	
	Maori	Non-Maori	Maori	Non-Maori
House	69.4	85.5	83.0	86.9
Flat	-	6.8	1.4	7.1
Bach/Hut	26.3	3.2	12.0	2.0
Temporary	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.1
Other	1.6	2.1	0.6	0.6
Occupancy Rates				
	Maori		Non-Maori	
1936	5.8		3.9	
1951	5.5		3.7	

Overcrowding did decline during the period, with overcrowded Maori dwellings declining by 34% and grossly overcrowded dwellings declining by 19%. However, the differences between Maori and non-Maori were still marked. Only 7% of Maori receive loans during the period with the Board of Maori Affairs imposing an informal limit of 66% with applicants having to find the remaining deposit.

The urbanisation of Maori during and after the Second World War was to raise questions about housing policy that no previous government had to answer. In the past, the emphasis had been on keeping Maori on their remaining lands in the rural areas. Now manufacturers wanted cheap labour. The new arrivals to New Zealand towns generally occupied the worst housing, most vulnerable to redevelopment of the inner cities. These changes exposed racism amongst town-dwellers and landlords which had always been evident but never so obvious. Such attitudes had been recorded in the nineteenth century amongst boarding housekeepers who would often deny board and lodgings to Maori. One such example was at Waihi where local Waihi Maori had won the support of the Police Sergeant for those reasons. The sergeant petitioned the government for a hostel on the grounds that he had to provide accommodation in police cells for travelling Maori women and children because local hotels would not provide accommodation and no Maori lived in the town. The Tauranga hostel became famous in 1936 when local Pakeha women petitioned for its restoration in order to avoid having Maori women use the ordinary women's restrooms when they visited the town.

Maori groups had always insisted that they had a right to state housing from the first years of inception; as New Zealanders and as workers. They also

argued that they had a right to assistance on the grounds of the atrocious conditions that both urban and rural Maori suffered. But there was a general reluctance to develop a state rental programme for Maori. The reluctance to alter the principles of the general state housing scheme have been mentioned earlier. The Housing Construction Division had already been involved in building huts for Maori at Waihi but it was reluctant to take

For the State Advances Corporation the primary concern was that Maori tenants might subvert the role of state housing in improving and maintaining the living standards of respectable new Zealanders. Although Maori people might live in the European manner their sheer presence might have a detrimental effect on surrounding residents. If the Corporation took over responsibility for Maori residents, undesirable concentrations of Maori tenants might result.

Despite these attitudes the gradual entry of Maori into mainstream housing did happen during the period - at first because government found it had to house Maori who lived on land it wanted for housing. Secondly, it happened because the size of problems revealed in the urban areas forced some response from government which over-rode the attitudes of the Corporation and the Maori Affairs Department.

At Waiwhetu in the Hutt Valley the government agreed to build 22 houses for Maori residents and beneficiaries on land it bought from Maori owners. A similar agreement was eventually made with Ngati Whatua o Orakei in order to be able to let state houses built on the land. There was a concern at the impact of rundown Maori dwellings adjacent to the new state houses. Further agreements were made to provide housing for Maori at Kamo - not in return for land but in order to keep miners at the coal mine which had been identified as an essential war industry. These arguments established concentrations of Maori in fact.

But these concentrations of Maori at Waiwhetu, Orakei and Kamo would soon become anomalies in the state suburbs at least until the 1960s when Maori would be placed in large numbers at Otara in Auckland. Eventually, the special status of Orakei and Waiwhetu would be lost as officials opened up the housing to all applicants.

As early as 1939 the State Advances Corporation found that of the six state houses it had built at Orakei two were hard to let because they were adjacent to existing Maori housing. During 1940, Corporation officers continued to argue that the houses were a health problem. In reaction to a suggestion that some of the occupants be housed in state housing the Auckland Branch Manager stated that it "could not in any circumstances be recommended in view of the habits of the Maori and the manner in which they are content to live". Agitation from Pakeha tenants waiting for state houses forced the decision to erect certain houses for Orakei residents "of a particular type

suitable to natives"⁷. Initially, these houses were to be provided in New Lynn, Avondale and Onehunga except for one house which would provide for two elderly women who would not move away from the urupa.⁸

In late 1943, the issues were still being debated. H G Mason, the Minister of Native Affairs suggested that houses be built on the "high part" of Orakei for the 24 Maori living in shacks. During 1943, some families appear to have moved to New Lynn and Avondale but the government was still considering building five units on the hill. G Shepherd, the Acting Under-secretary of Native Affairs pressed the Director of Housing for houses - with priority for housing at Orakei 'to be administered by the State Advances Corporation as [the houses] are in the European fashion.'⁹ In late 1948, T.T. Ropiha was pressing for 25 units at Orakei for the evicted families, 60 units at Wellington, Rotorua 12, Hastings 12, Otaki 15, Levin 12, Ruatoria 20 with 5 needed immediately.

Final agreement was not accepted until 1949/1950. Even at that stage delivery was uncertain, depending on what was happening in the Maori pool generally.

The process at Kamo began in 1941 when the government became concerned that poor housing conditions would discourage miners from staying in the area. A problem however, was the presence of a group of Maori miners and their extended families especially with a Pakeha settlement nearby. Shepherd wrote to the Director of Housing Construction stating that Maori Affairs had available funds "but it felt that the establishment of a purely Maori settlement would not be in the best interests of the applicants. The policy of segregation, particularly in urban or industrial communities is acceptable neither to the Department nor to the Maoris themselves and at Kamo the people have indicated that they wish to be housed on a rental basis rather than individually seek loans under the Maori Housing Act 1935". Shepherd went on to suggest that the Maori applicants be dispersed amongst the other miners with the houses eventually to be sold to them. In the meantime, the Native Affairs Department would administer the houses as rental accommodation.¹⁰

In 1944, the situation was still being considered. A survey of conditions found there were four Public Works Department huts which were occupied by 9-10 families. They had been ordered to move but the Public Works Department refused to act until other accommodation was found.¹¹ The families had

⁷ Branch Manager, State Advances Corporation, Auckland to General Manager, State Advances Corporation, 17 October 1940, National Archives, SAC 1 35/232

⁸ Minister of Housing to General Manager, State Advances Corporation, 20 October 1941, National Archives, SAC 1 35/232

⁹ 11 April 1944, National Archives, SAC 1, 35/232

¹⁰ National Archives, HD 1 3/211/41

¹¹ Memo to Branch Manager, Auckland, from G H Philson, Property Inspector, 31 June 1944, National Archives, HD 3 3/3/13 Pt1

been directed to Kamo by the National Services Department but had been unable to find housing. A further report found that the men had brought their wives, families and friends "in the Maori style". Twenty-eight people were living in the huts with no conveniences.

The Miners Union pressed for state houses to be built - thereby releasing "the poorer houses for Maori. The Director of the Housing Construction Division wrote to the Director that "obviously action is required to either break up the Maori settlement which is growing, or a second Orakei will develop".¹² A further problem was identified by officials: Kamo was virtually a suburb of Whangarei, if a group of Maori were housed then this would go against the governments policy of avoiding concentrations. Finally, in June 1948 R B Hammond of the Housing Construction Department stated that he believed a case had been made for "improving the living conditions of the Maoris at Kamo" and suggested that a scheme similar to Tamaki be tried. In November 1948, nine units were made available.¹³

At Waiwhetu in the Hutt Valley a large area of land was brought between 1945-47 from Maori on the condition that twenty-two houses be made available for beneficiaries. The Hutt Valley Tribal Committee also pressed for special preference in the allocation process. The State Advances Corporation considered that the twenty-two houses were sufficient recompense for the dispossessed and that all other applications should be assessed alongside everyone else. During 1947, there was some question of extending the scheme but the Minister of Housing noted in a letter to Walter Nash, Minister of Finance that "there was a feeling among many departmental officers, particularly the representatives of the Native Department that some advantage might arise from dispersing among the European community the Maori families who were being asked to vacate existing dwellings". However, pressure from the Maori community for a community centre along with the houses finally persuaded the government to agree. Hackett however, also noted "it has long been my own opinion that as a nation we will be less prone to any suggestion of segregation with its attendant evils, only if Maori and Pakeha alike adopt one cultural standard".

The final agreement at Waiwhetu provided for a three step process where an applicant wanted a house then a section and house would be transferred back after the area was developed. Where compensation was not enough to cover this then applicants could borrow from the state. Where compensation was too small for lending then preference would be given over twenty-two state houses.¹⁴

¹² 9 November 1944, National Archives, HD 3 3/3/13 Pt 1

¹³ 25 June 1948, HD 3 3/3/13 pt; Director of Housing Construction to the General Manager, State Advances Corporation, National Archives, HD 3, 3/3/13 pt 1

¹⁴ Minister in charge of State House Allocations to Minister of Finance, 21 July 1947; Branch Manager, Wellington, to General Manager State Advances Corporation, 29 July 1947; Minister of Housing to Minister of Housing, 22 August 1947; R B Hammond to General Manager, State Advances Corporation, 1948, SAC 1, 35/232/5

The most far-reaching agreement was at Tamaki in Auckland. In 1949 Rangi Royal from the Department of Maori Affairs surveyed conditions amongst Maori living in the Panmure/Pt England area. The settlement consisted of local Maori as well as new residents. The poor housing was more visible and was well publicised by the press. Royal estimated that at least 1200 houses were needed in Auckland, some 500 urgently.

The government agreed to the construction of 60 houses at Tamaki and initially looked to the Native Department to build and manage them. The Department decided that it did not have the skills being used to the construction of only two or three houses at a time. It asked the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works (the old Housing Construction Branch) to build the houses as part of its mainstream programme. It agreed and the State Advances Corporation was given the task of administering them in conjunction with the Native Department. The latter would work with the local tribal allocation committee to decide who got the houses.

It was at this time that the Native Department introduced the idea of pepper potting Maori amongst the state tenants at Tamaki. This was for a number of reasons. It felt that the tenants would benefit from their association with Pakeha tenants, and also feared the reaction of the latter if concentrations occurred. This was a development to the notion that good quality housing would "improve" the occupants; an idea that had been central to the model housing schemes proposed under the 1900 Municipal Corporations Act. Now the Department of Maori Affairs had moved towards the view that spreading Maori amongst Pakeha would encourage them to adopt a Europeanised way of life. It was not to be full assimilation in the sense that Maori would have access to home ownership under the mainstream state lending programme. Nonetheless Europeanisation was to become a major factor in deciding the degree to which Maori would gain access to state housing resources.

In 1948, Cabinet approved the provision of state rental housing for Maori as a linked but separate part of the state housing programme and approval was finally and formally given for construction at Tamaki, Orakei, Waiwhetu and Kamo. But the government was to quickly formalise the pepper potting requirements only one in ten houses at Whangarei were to house Maori families. By December 1951, the Acting General Manager had called a halt to allocations to Maori at Tamaki/Point England in Auckland because of complaints from other tenants. In 1952 there was a concerted campaign by tenants to be shifted because of the presence of Maori. To the State Advances Corporation's credit - having advanced on a policy of placing Maori at Tamaki the halt to allocations was only temporary and the complaints of the other tenants were not generally heeded. The Minister of Maori Affairs in a memo to the Minister in charge of the State Advances Corporation stated:

- "(a) the community must be encouraged in every possible way to receive the Maori tenants and householders among them harmoniously.

- (b) the disposal of Maori state tenancies in Wendell Avenue is not unreasonable.
- (c) a similar set of circumstances so far as the proportion of Maori houses to European will not doubt naturally occur in many streets in all parts of the country in the future".

Officers of the Department of Maori Affairs in their administration of the ideas of the Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945 are doing and will continue to do all they can to assist Maori state housing tenants everywhere to accept their full responsibilities and obligations. A tolerant and constructive attitude by Europeans towards their neighbours will undoubtedly be of material assistance".¹⁵

Thus by 1948 Maori had gained access to state houses on the basis of need, albeit through a specialised process. The principle of construction and administration of Maori occupied public housing by the general agencies had also been established. In late 1949, T T Ropiha, Under-Secretary for Maori Affairs, requested that the government set aside a pool of houses within the main state housing stock for Maori. Just before the 1949 election the government agreed. Towns with a sizeable number of Maori pool houses would have their allocation committees; in the smaller towns Maori applicants would be assessed by the general allocation committees. Ropiha argued strongly for Maori representatives on these general committees but his arguments were rejected on the grounds that there should be no discrimination between applicants. In reality, in these areas the belief that Maori would make bad tenants amongst some members of the allocation committee meant some missed out. The committees were also careful to avoid concentrations of Maori. Although Maori were free to apply, few did.

The Maori pool houses were still technically separate from the other state houses and the Maori Affairs Department still had ostensible responsibility for them. This separation underlined the government's insistence that providing housing assistance on the basis of need was not the normal part of the programme. It continued to take a similar attitude with pensioner housing.

Although the rents were still technically unsubsidised the Corporation was always extremely nervous that the presence of Maori as a particular group would undermine the principles underpinning the state housing and state lending schemes. By 1949 Maori had gained some increase in lending and had gained access in a limited way to the mainstream housing stock. These gains were a response to the poor housing problems of urban and rural Maori and not part of any wider scheme to assimilate Maori into the mainstream.

¹⁵

Section 5 1950-1972

Between 1950 and 1972 the primary focus of government housing policy was on home ownership and the encouragement of a building industry capable of producing large numbers of houses quickly. The emphasis was also on the production of new houses for first home owners on the edges of the main towns and cities. In contrast the centres of the main towns once again came under the scrutiny of town planners and business people who wished to remove the "slums" and redevelop. During this period the symbol of the family home in the suburbs was to become thoroughly entrenched in peoples minds. Ironically, it was at a time when immense social change brought pressures and that led some groups to question assumptions about family life as the centre of the New Zealand dream.

In the twenty years after the war 225,000 people emigrated to New Zealand and coupled with a dramatically increased birth rate, amongst Pakeha as well as other groups, the population increased from 1.7 million in 1945 to 3.1 million in 1975. However, from the 1960s the Pakeha birth rate began to decline while household composition changed rapidly. Single person households increased markedly from the 1960s among Pakeha - some changes resulting from the aging of the populating and the rest from lifestyle choices. The number of children born outside marriage also increased. Married women also entered the workforce in large numbers and by the 1970s the second income they brought to the family was essential to any family buying a house. This growing trend of women entering the workplace revealed many of the tensions inherent in the policies which promoted home ownership. The suburb and the New Zealand home was built on the notion of separating home and work and the place of women in the home. The location, design and purpose of such housing mean extra strains on a family when both adults worked.

Ironically, during this period the growth of suburbs was seen by some as harmful to social stability and unsustainable in terms of the costs to the community. Some saw the dream of the homogenous "classless" suburb as a chimera and as the gap between dream and reality widened it was identified by some as a destabilising force in itself. And while governments did continue to make use of all the traditional rhetoric of family, home and suburb, in reality had they begun to reduce investment in home ownership significantly from the 1960s.

5.1 **Mainstream Housing Policies: 1950-1972**

National's first move in taking power was to place limits on the number of people seeking entry to state housing: if demand could be reduced pressure for the construction of state housing would lessen - leaving the route open for the government to focus its attention on state lending. In 1950 it introduced an income limit on those applying for state housing. This was the first of a

number of moves that was to slowly shift state housing to a "welfare role" rather than as an alternative mainstream tenure. But National had made no attempt to reduce rents or in any way subsidise poorer applicants. Along with setting an income limit the government tightened up the assessment of need and firmly excluded single people from state help even if their need was deemed urgent.

But the most far reaching action was the sale of state houses with generous lending rates, below the government's usual terms. At first sales were made only to tenants placed before 1950; after 1953 all tenants were eligible. By 1957 10,657 houses had been sold. National also abandoned the idea of comprehensively planned suburbs. Although the separation of activities and the roading pattern was kept the government was to reject any role in providing services, community facilities or shops. All this was to contribute to the down grading of state housing to a tenure suitable for the country's underclass, incapable of taking advantage of the government's general lending policies.

The quality of state housing also changed as the government tried to reduce unit costs. It explored minimal detached housing designs but it also began to explore the possibility of flats as an alternative to the family home. This was motivated by the wish to reduce urban sprawl and infrastructure costs as well as the individual costs of each house.

National's primary interest was in home ownership - in 1950 state loans counted for 19% of all houses built in that year and by 1954 this had risen to 33.6%. State housing dropped from 29.3% to 17.8% over the same period. In 1953, it found that 26,000 houses were needed over the next 10 years and began to explore more far-reaching solutions.

In 1953, it introduced the "Group Housing" scheme where the government guaranteed to buy back any houses built that were not sold - where the builder constructed six or more houses at any one time. At first the intention was to have the builders provide their own land; in reality land shortages meant that the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works would provide a large number of sections. The result was the mixing of state housing and private housing whereas previously the two types of housing had generally been separate. The state also became heavily involved in setting the specifications for private housing - so that the design traditionally used for state housing were to have a major influence on all housing during the period.

The shortage of land for mass building was to become a major constraint on construction during the period and the Housing Division was continually being pressed to release developed land. The government turned to alternatives to encourage the release of land - for example, by developing an insurance leasehold system and the deferred lease system.

During this period the government developed two major suburbs on the edge

of Wellington and Auckland as a basis for the mass housing schemes. Other similar schemes were developed in Christchurch and Dunedin but not on the scale of those found at Porirua and Otara. They were also larger in the end than the various schemes found in the Hutt Valley and around the suburbs of the Auckland isthmus area that were developed by the first Labour government. Massive earthworks were involved, particularly in the Titahi Bay/Porirua development and considerable attention was paid to road layout and provision of a hierarchy of shopping facilities. Unlike the earlier suburbs however the government would not build the actual shops.

The government continued to take a central role in the development of these suburbs along with the provision of land. The motivating force was the extension of "home ownership" to as many deserving families as possible. However, despite attempts to lower costs through the mass production of housing the government was to find that there were limits. Although National did not necessarily gain votes from moderate and lower income groups ensuring home ownership "to all" was a central tenet of its political rhetoric.

By the late 1950s this created a tension for the government which was exacerbated by the growing concerns in Treasury circles that National's practice of restricting or stimulating building industry, according to the needs of the wider economy was becoming a destabilising force. The cost of continuing to resource home ownership was high - with government housing expenditure fluctuating between 10% and 18% of total government expenditure during the period. It turned to reducing the cost of housing during this period as a solution.

As early as 1953 the government began to promote low-rise flats - through a range of "Demonstration flats" designs. Badly designed and of poor quality materials they quickly became a problem. The desire to reduce costs also became coupled with concerns about the costs of urban sprawl. From 1957 the Housing division experimented with a number of variations on the lower rise flats - the most well known being the three or four storey Star flats. In 1957 the government introduced a policy which required 25% and later 50% of new state houses to be multi-unit. This included housing for families with children. Between 1957 and 1960 the Labour government continued the policy and by the late 1960s the large suburbs of the period - Otara, Porirua and Mangere all had a large number of multi-unit dwellings.

Although the apparent abandonment of the detached family home was a seemingly radical departure from the New Zealand dream, the Labour Government was to introduce the most radical change to state lending yet. It introduced the 3% concessionary loans for families earning less than £1,000 a year in recognition that housing problems could not be overcome simply by producing more houses - affordability issues now took centre stage. The concessionary loans, coupled with the introduction of the capitalisation of the family benefit in early 1959 led to a huge number of loans being let between

1959 and 1963 when the National government began to tighten up on these low interest loans again.

Nonetheless the effects of these policies were remarkable - in 1959 1,932 loans were let by the State Advances Corporation with 67% let at the 3% rate. By late 1960 12,015 loans were let for new housing with 77% at the 3% rate. The concessionary loan and the capitalisation of the family benefit were as an important symbol of housing policy in the 1960s as state housing was in the 1940s. Home ownership rates rose from 61.2% in 1951 to 69% in 1966 - although freehold rates would drop from 30.7% to 27.6%. But the reality was that just as it seemed that the state would dominate housing construction it began to withdraw. From the mid 1960s the government began to argue the housing problem was over - as a way of justifying its withdrawal.

Lending peaked in 1961 when 52% of all residential buildings were funded by the state - by 1972 this figure had declined to 28%. Not only was the amount available for lending reduced but the National government refused to readjust the income limits for lending, effectively excluding many families who had otherwise been eligible. This withdrawal from financing the dream occurred for two main reasons: concerns about impacts on the wider economy, the impacts and concerns about urban sprawl; growing criticisms about the quality of the resulting suburbs.

5.2 Maori Housing Policy: 1950-1972

In the 1950s the promotion of home ownership and a "property owning democracy" was the primary focus of the National government. Where past governments had sought to achieve social stability and deliver the New Zealand dream through a material vision of family home and suburb home ownership was to become the source of stability and the dream itself. There had been hints of this in the Reform government's policies of the 1920s but now such thinking was to dominate throughout the next two decades.

Maori did gain increased access to housing resources during the 1950s and 1960s but few became home owners - many more became reliant on state housing. Although the benefits of home ownership in encouraging Maori to embrace the suburban life had been a minor theme in the late 1940s the National government, which ruled throughout the period except for the years between late 1957 and 1960, never seriously intended to extend home ownership to Maori in any comprehensive way. The 1935 Native Housing Act was passed, not as a way of incorporating rural Maori into the dream, but as a response to appalling housing conditions. The 1938 amendment targeted assistance to the destitute; this was welfare legislation and the first housing policies that directly addressed the issues of poverty.

The National government was firmly convinced of the power of home ownership but it also adhered closely to the long-standing principle that the

material rewards of family home and ownership were just that - rewards for individual endeavour, thrift and respectability. To subsidise the dream was to undermine it. Improved housing conditions for the very poor would be achieved through mass production of improved housing. It was the Labour government that opened up access to home ownership for moderate and low income families in the late 1950s with the introduction of the 3% loan and family benefit capitalisation. And it was during this period that urban Maori families were to make the greatest gains in terms of home ownership. But from 1962 the National government rapidly reduced resources for low interest loans and access to home ownership rapidly dried up. Maori access dried up with it.

It was during the 1950s that use made of housing policy by the state to assimilate Maori into a European or Pakeha way of life became the most explicit. Now the urbanisation of Maori made it very clear that there was another major cultural group with its own ways of living and values that was becoming a major presence in the towns. The view of the suburb as a homogenising force that moulded all who lived in them seemed under threat if Maori lived together in large groups.

Two further associated themes led officials to concentrate on the mixing of Maori amongst other suburban dwellers. The first was the fear that concentrations of Maori would lead to accusations of ghettoisation. This stemmed from a view that Maori would prefer to live apart and made no distinction between forces that caused concentrations of Maori in certain areas because of poverty and the cultural desire to live together. To have a concentration of Maori would undercut the view that New Zealand suburbs were the full expression of an ultimately egalitarian society.

Officials were also concerned about concentrations because of the racism of many of the Pakeha residents which became noticeable when such concentrations threatened. When the 60 houses at Tamaki were approved these fears surfaced and officials spent a considerable amount of time fending off complaints from residents about concentrations. Pepper potting as an "official" policy was soon as a way of forestalling such problems.

The Department of Maori Affairs also saw itself having a major role in influencing relationships between Maori and non-Maori. It took an active part in the formulation of the "pepper potting" concept and actively promoted greater contact between Maori and Pakeha by encouraging urban drift and the scattering of Maori amongst the general community. E Corbett, the Minister of Maori Affairs between 1949 and 1957 did hold potentially integrationist views in that he maintained the right of Maori to retain their culture, but he believed that it should be occurring within mainstream life. However, Corbett was more interested in clarifying the status of Maori title in order to allow use of land than social issues, and he did not pursue the issue of what was happening in housing policy to any degree. Although the Department of Maori Affairs were to support Maori cultural expression its housing policies

were to remain firmly anchored to the Pakeha model of housing and suburban life.

In 1961 the Department of Maori Affairs made a clear statement that it saw housing as central to the process of bringing Maori into contact with Pakeha culture and ensuring that Maori had sufficient access to resources to ensure social and economic equality. In 1960 Jack Hunn was appointed to the Department as Acting Secretary and in 1961 he delivered a report which tempered, to a degree, the markedly assimilationist policies of the 1950s. The report divided Maori people into three general groups: 'a detribalised minority whose Maoritanga is only vestigial ... The main body of Maori, pretty much at home in either society who like to partake of both ... Another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions'. He suggested that the government should elevate the last group to the level of the second and leave it to Maori to decide if they wished to join the first. Hunn saw the encouragement of urbanisation and the use of social policy, including social policy, as essential to what he saw as integration. To that end he pressed for increased delivery of housing resources to Maori and, in particular, increased access to home-ownership. Such access was the right of Maori as citizens, and if extra resources were necessary then that was acceptable.

However, what the Hunn report did not address was the issue of the quality of resources to be delivered to Maori. Having argued for improved access to home-ownership and an improved quality of housing there was no analysis of the design of housing and the acceptability of the traditional suburban lifestyle. Nor was there any examination of the policy of pepper-potting. The question of whether integration rather than assimilation meant a re-examination of the nature of the housing to be delivered remained unasked. Integration it seemed was to occur within the parameters of the official vision of the detached family home in the suburbs.

Pepper potting was to remain in vogue well into the late 1960s. And it was to become quite complex to administer especially as the larger suburbs absorbed a mixture of state houses, houses funded by state lending, by the Department of Maori Affairs and by the banks. For example, in December 1961, the Housing Construction Division extracted an agreement from the Whangarei District Officer, Maori Affairs, to limit the number of loans on the Otangarei Block as Group Builders were also selling to Maori and the concentrations of Maoris were becoming unacceptable.

Maori gained access to mainstream government housing resources primarily on the basis of poverty, and not from any acknowledgement that Maori people needed special programmes because they faced discrimination in the housing market or had particular cultural needs. Such an approach was not to emerge until the late 1970s when Maori began to argue for and demand a specific response to such issues. The pool system approved in the late 1940s was a specific response to the housing conditions uncovered by the Maori Affairs Department amongst urban Maori. But in practice it was to prove something

of a strait jacket. T T Ropiha, the Under-Secretary for Maori Affairs had suggested at the time that the number of pool houses set aside should be based on the percentage of Maori population in any one area. This was rejected on the grounds that it would unduly favour Maori - although there were a disproportionate number of Maori experiencing housing problems. Instead, the pool system was based on the proportion of urgent Maori applications to the number of urgent non-Maori applications. While there were still many Maori that did not apply because of lack of familiarity with the system and the fear of being turned away, potentially the policy meant that the level of need could dictate the response.

Practice was very different. Between 1948 and 1954 only 97 pool houses were handed over to the Maori Affairs Department for allocation. Some state Advances corporation managers resisted adding to the pool because it would add to the concentration of Maori. Some resisted allocation to Maori at all and used the pool houses for non-Maori tenants. In the end allocations to the pool bore no relation to the number of urgent allocations made. In 1953-54 financial year, for example, 356 urgent applications were made by Maori, 15.2% of the total of 2,336. On that basis 130 of the 850 houses planned for the year should have gone to Maori. In March 1953 the Department of Maori Affairs had succeeded to getting agreement to 40 houses. In the end a total of 580 houses were actually built of which 88 should have gone to the pool; only 26 were delivered.

During the 1950s Maori pool allocations were as follows:

	Yearly Allocation	Actual Houses as a % of State Houses
1951	20	0.6
1952	91 (including 19 for Otara)	5.2
1953	59	2.8
1954	50	1.8
1955	80	2.8
1956	57	2.5
1957	57	2.0
1958	35	3.7
1959	62	4.3
1960	92	4.7
1961	102	2.7

Despite these problems Maori did gain increased access to state housing. And as they did, of course, the increased numbers began to place pressure on the government's policy of pepper potting. The Maori Womens Welfare League had also undertaken a major campaign to highlight the continuing plight of urban Maori. The League had been told that there was limited demand for state housing among Maori in Auckland. They uncovered large numbers which placed pressure on the Auckland Branch to respond.

During the early 1950s Auckland City Council had also been looking at slum clearance schemes in the central city. Freemans Bay was identified as a clearance area and an agreement was reached with the State Advances Corporation that it would give priority to the housing of those displaced by the clearance scheme. To the embarrassment of the Corporation it found that many of those displaced were Maori, Indian or recent immigrants from Pacific Island countries. It insisted that the housing of these groups was the responsibility of the Department of Maori Affairs; Maori Affairs insisted that it only had responsibility for Maori and that in any case it did not have the means to house them. In direct contradiction of the general policy of avoiding concentrations the Corporation agreed to house many of the displaced Maori at Otara the new suburb on the edge of Auckland as a way of avoiding their placement amongst the older established suburbs of Mt Roskill, Waterview and Te Papapa. This concession was the first step in the major concentration of Maori at Otara from the late 1950s. It also forced the government to step outside the pool system.

But the greatest change that opened up state housing to Maori was the gradual abandonment of state housing as a mainstream tenure. With its emphasis on state lending and home ownership the government was reluctant to continue to promote state housing as a tenure equal in status to home ownership. Various political concessions to existing tenants and the slow falling behind of rents to actual costs meant that by the early 1960s there was a growing expectation that state housing be available to the poorest and most disadvantaged. The success of the state lending policies also meant that as home ownership expanded renting became an option really associated with those unable to afford home ownership. In the end, state housing was to become a welfare tenure and Maori along with the increasing number of solo parents, and Pacific Island peoples became the group most likely to need and use public housing.

The Department of Maori Affairs continued to have responsibility for lending on and building houses for Maori and increasingly it concentrated its efforts on the urban area. By 1961, 53% of its building and lending was for housing in the urban area. In effect, it was administering a parallel process to that provided by the State Advances Corporation.

Initially, the Department was slow to respond to the housing needs of poorer Maori, continuing to advocate a cost-recovery approach that effectively kept its lending services beyond the scope of many. The State Advances

Corporation also believed that the Department's loans should not offer any greater concessions than those for mainstream lending. That the Department always had more than enough work did reflect the growing incomes of many Maori workers but it was still failing to respond to the lowest income groups. This was despite the growing recognition of the welfare nature of the 1935 and 1938 legislation. There was opposition from within the Board of Maori Affairs and Treasury to any hint of subsidy and it was not until the 1960s that hardship became a significant factor in the authorisation of loans.

The Department at this time existed to fill a gap in the mortgage market interest rates were never low enough for many households. The government had given the Board the ability to lend over a period 35 years but it took Treasury's advice and continued to lend over the more usual 25 year period - thus foregoing the chance to reduce weekly payments (even if total interest paid remained high). The Board's upper limits for loans were also far lower than those charged by the State Advances Corporation (usually 66.66% compared with 75%). The Department also began to build its houses to the same physical standard as Pakeha housing. This meant an increase in costs and a need for higher deposits. By the late 1950s the special fund was also exhausted and had to be rebuilt slowly.

Attitudes to the targeting of Maori Affairs resources softened during the 1950s as the board finally delegated full responsibility for the authorisation of loans to the Under-Secretary, T Ropiha and the Department set up its own committee to handle the matter. It began to accept that it could help poorer families and it began to lend to the limit wherever possible. Eventually the Treasury objected to what it saw as a dangerous increase in high risk loans. This had always been the reason in the past for the Department requiring high deposits because it did see Maori families as a more risky investment with increased dangers that they might not repay.

The Department continued to define its role as providing for Maori who were not sufficiently "Europeanised" or comfortable with Pakeha institutions to be able to fund themselves in the mainstream. The Board of Maori Affairs had made a distinction between Maori living in the European manner and other Maori as early as 1941. In that year, the Under-Secretary of Native Affairs commented on an application from a Maori who had land in Gisborne township to offer as security. "I have to advise that strictly speaking this case could be covered by the Native Housing Act 1935 ... but most of the dwellings erected under the Act are simple and cheap in construction, and in general confined to rural districts. In cases, where Natives are residing in towns and boroughs and are living and working as Europeans, the Board of Maori Affairs considers that these applications are outside the scope of our operations". Clearly, the Department saw its role as assisting those Maori that had not yet adapted to the mainstream.¹⁶

¹⁶ General Manager, State Advances Corporation to Residential Officer, Gisborne, 5 March 1941, SAL 1 32/1/5

In 1953, the Department of Maori Affairs sought the Corporation's reaction to the suggestion that "the better class of Maori applicants ... be required to avail themselves at the same loan facilities as European applicants". The Department anticipated some reaction from Maori - who undoubtedly benefited from some savings in building costs through the direct construction by the Department's building organisation. The Corporation noted that Maori applicants had always been free to apply but that yes it would accept the "better class" of applicant although they would have to show creditworthiness. This was later elaborated into a requirement for proof that the applicant was living in a European manner, that the "personal factor" was satisfactory and that the security offered was in a European settlement.¹⁷

The Board restated its concerns in 1954 that Maori living in the "European manner" and Maori women married to European men or with only a fraction of Maori blood should not be eligible for Departmental assistance. In June 1954, it set out the grounds for eligibility in order to properly carry out the business of "an organisation which sets out to meet from limited resources an acute social need". The criteria included the degree of Maori blood, including the Maori blood of the breadwinner, the degree to which the applicants behaviour conformed to "expected norms of the community" and finally financial security. Having issued the circular the Department found that the State Advances Corporation was requiring all Maori to apply to Maori Affairs first. The reaction was immediate "Nothing should be done to suggest that a Maori, because he is Maori, is under any disadvantage in seeking Corporation finance".¹⁸

During the mid to late 1950s the Secretary M Sullivan pressed for increased funds and for a foregoing of a minimum deposit while the Treasury argued that a minimum deposit be required. Maori Affairs strenuously opposed this because increasingly it wanted social factors to be a consideration in lending. If a family was especially needy and the Department could help by lending to the limit it would do so. The Labour Cabinet sanctioned this view in October 1958 - a move consistent with the increased targeting of home ownership with 3% loans.

With increasing urbanisation land prices rose with prospective borrowers having to own their land outright. This meant high up front costs and in response the Department turned to the deferred payment or renewable lease sectors. In 1958-59 the Department tried to get the Department to agree to reserve 10% of sections developed by the Ministry of Works for Maori clients, but Cabinet refused. Generally, there was a shortage of sections and the government was reluctant to tag any for specific purposes; it was also concerned that concentrations of Maori would result.

¹⁷ Acting General Manager to the Secretary Maori Affairs, 12 November 1953, SAL 1 32/1/5

¹⁸ Assistance Secretary, Department of Maori Affairs to the General Manager State Advances Corporation, 27 August 1954, SAC 1, 32/1/5

As the Department shifted slowly to the idea of targeting its lending it began to look for ways to direct other applicants to the State Advances Corporation lending programme. Maori had, of course, always been able to apply - although the various expectations about behaviour and lifestyle limited the outcome. In 1960 a circular was set to all Maori Affairs and Corporation officials stating that the Corporation would deal with all applications not provided for by the Maori Affairs. It would grant loans if the site was suitable and officials judged that the applicant could meet their financial commitments. But the Corporation would hand back any that were in areas where it did not lend or "where there [was] a definite housing need but [the] branch considers that the applicant requires the guidance of the Maori Affairs Department". Such guidance was necessary to ensure that an applicant could "become accustomed to live in a European fashion" and therefore able to accept the responsibility of home ownership.

Maori living in remote rural areas and Maori who were not deemed sufficiently Europeanised to permit the risk of lending were caught between the two organisations. Clearly, even by the 1960s Maori were not only limited by the requirements of pepper potting but by the assumption that Maori living in the Maori way were a risk. The State Advances Corporation still saw its role as delivering and protecting the New Zealand dream as a package of thrift, respectability, family values and suburban life.

Generally, applicants succeeded in obtaining State Advances Corporation loans if officials believed they lived in the Pakeha way. This included the expectation that only the immediate family of parents and children would live in the houses. Applicants who wished to capitalise their family benefit also had to apply to the Social Security Commission, who had the right to turn an applicant down. In one case at least, the Commission declined capitalisation for a Maori applicant because the 'family were unsuited for home ownership at the time'.

During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s home ownership was extended to Maori as a means to an end - as a reward for adopting a Pakeha way of life. For those Maori who had not proved respectability by owning a home and who were accepted into state housing, improvement and change would be achieved through the emulation of Pakeha neighbours. In reality however, concentrations occurred as Maori were squeezed out of home ownership from mid 1960s as the government reduced its investment in cheap homes. Concentration of Maori increased and was one of the factors in the governments slow abandonment of direct support of the dream. As the dream itself faltered, politicians lost interest in the potential of the suburban life and material wellbeing to assimilate groups into official New Zealand society. During the 1980s this material utopia was abandoned to market forces in favour of a social stability, it was argued, that could be achieved through increased productivity and the opening up of the market to the individual.

In the 1980s there was to be a major questioning of many of the principles, design and policies associated with the suburban housing that the state had delivered for so long. Rural housing policies for Maori were questioned and finally a system was established to allow Maori access to lending on land in Maori title. Many of the state house designs were reviewed by the Housing Corporation which also began to re-examine the delivery systems to Maori. In some senses housing policies in the 1980s was more responsive to the particular cultural requirements of Maori than it had ever been before. Ironically this was because of the increasing number of Maori using state housing and the shift to a state housing welfare policy.

But for all these changes Maori access to the dream itself had begun to slide - indeed from the 1963 when the National government had withdrawn the high level of support for cheap loans the chances of Maori having access to homeownership on any scale had begun to recede. In 1976 52% of Maori owned their own home; the figure had dropped to 45% in 1981. It was to rise to 49% in 1986 but homeownership rates were still 20% lower than those for Pakeha. Maori families had been particularly dependent on family benefit capitalisations and concessionary interest rates in order to become homeowners in the 1960s. This slowing of access to homeownership represented a very real exclusion from status, wealth and security of tenure.

By 1986 nearly 36% of all Maori households were dependent on Housing Corporation state housing and they occupied 26% of the state housing stock. Nearly 47% of all households headed by Maori women lived in state houses. Maori had gained access to state houses but they were now living in an increasingly under resourced welfare tenure rather than a part of the suburban dream.

Section 6 Expanded Chronology

Set out below is an expanded chronology between 1914 and September 1962 when the land under claim was gazetted under the Public Works Act. The chronology includes those entries listed under the report prepared by ... Additional items are shaded. The WAI 60 Document Bank referred to in the original report was not available to be referred to for the preparation of this report. It should be noted that a number of entries in the original chronology are not referenced and these could not be checked. References are provided for all other entries and those references from the original chronology which have been identified.

6.1 Chronological Summary of Documents Relating to the Wai 60 Claim

The following summary of relevant documents is set out in chronological order. Where entries are based on the chronology provided in the initial Wai 650 report this is noted. All other sources are listed in the brackets after each entry.

Note: This chronology provides additional information relevant to the land involved in the Wai 60 claim and other associated lands involved in the developments around the Porirua settlement up until the gazetting of C2A3.

1914 October 28

Partition order states that Takapuwahia C2A 14:3:39 acres is owned by Waitaoro Raniera. [Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1915 October 16

Order of Exchange whereby in trust of sole owner Waitaora Raniera in Takapuwahia C2A is vested to:

Ngawaina Hanikamu	1/3
Wo Katene Tipo	1/3
Turama Mohi Nopera	1/12
Te Kaha Mohi Nopera	1/12
Wikitoria Mohi Nopera	1/12
Karawa Mohi Nopera	1/12

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1920 October 21

Partition Order divides the block into three sub-sections:

Takapuwahia C2A1 (4:3:39 acres) to Wi Katene Tipo solely
Takapuwahia C2A2 (4:3:39.5 acres) to the Nopera Family (4)
Takapuwahia C2A3 (4:3:39:3 acres) to Ngawaina Hanikamu
solely

1920 October 21 (Cont'd)

The order also provides a right of way of 15 links wide along the eastern boundary of C2A2 to give access to the Northern and Southern subdivisions from No.8 street.

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1921 April 29

Plan of Takapuwahia C2A3, Block 1 Belmont SD

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1931 September Makara County Council to Maori Affairs Department

Concerned at conditions at Pa and intention to undertake a survey.

[MA1, 30/3/112]

1931 September 17 Makara County Council

Notes tuberculosis problems at the Pa.

[MA1, 30/3/112]

1931 September 21 Memo from District Officer of Health to Director General of Health:

- Visited Pa on 18 September
- 20 houses - 80 adults and 64 children "while unprepossessing weather tight and well looked after, some overcrowding"

[MA1, 30/3/112]

1934 January 8 Medical Officer of Health to Director General of Health:

Porirua Village Committee trying to obtain houses from the Public Works Department to be paid for from the Nelson tenths plus a small levy.

D Prosser, member of Wellington Maori Council saw a need for 5 houses.

[MA1, 30/3/112]

1934 February 21 Medical Officer of Health to Director General of Health:

All except 3 families have lodged applications for housing loans through the Native Department.

[MIA, 30/3/112]

1937 August 17

Memorandum of Transfer: sole owner Ngawainu Hanikamu gives land to Pirikawau Parai.

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1943 March 30 Director of Housing Construction to Ministry of Housing re. Tawa Flat - Titahi Bay District

Decision made to proceed with a large-scale development. A Notice of Intention should be issued over a large area "Careful surveys fixing the exact land required could then be put in hand and the land proclaimed."

[HD 6/244 1]

1944 August 8 Director of Housing Construction to Minister of Works

Officers have tried buying without success by negotiation. There is a disinclination to sell "indicates a desire to wait for higher prices, and in fact land values will naturally harden in line with the Government's programme for intensive development in these localities."

[HD 6/244 1]

1944 December 12 Memo from Director of Housing Construction, Ministry of Works to Under-Secretary Maori Affairs

Notes the Directorate's interest in acquiring Allotments H1, D1A2A and D1A2B and native interests in D1A1B and the Takapuwahia Block for housing. David Prosser, owner of a large area of land has offered it to the government for sale. "Acquisition of the offered area would not be capable of economic development without the inclusion of the [above] land".

[Note: D Prosser was a member of the Makara County Council and at times a chair of the Ngati Toa Porirua Marae Committee. He was regarded by the government as a Europeanised Maori, despite involvement with the Marae Committee. His land was not regarded by government as "Native Lands"].

The Director asks the Under-Secretary whether the Minister of Maori Affairs would give consent to the taking of the [other] lands by proclamation under the Public Works Act if Prosser's land is acquired.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1945 January 15 Minister of Maori Affairs (File Note):

"I certainly don't feel disposed to agreeing to the Native Land at Porirua being taken contrary to the wishes or best interests of the Native Owners".

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1945 February 6 Memo from the Director of Housing Construction to the Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs:

"Consideration is at present being given to the early issue of a Note of Intention to acquire under the Public Works Act extensive areas in the Tawa Flat - Porirua - Titahi Bay localities ... This proposed scheme of housing development is of major proportions and will comprehensively include most of the suitable building

1945 February 6 (Cont'd)

The memo included a list of properties proposed for a Notice of Intention to take. Apart from Prosser's property the list included:

1	Popoteruru Block	CT 247/29 11ac 3r 0p
2	Tutaeparaikete Blk No.1 Subn 1A	(no CT)
3	Tutaeparaikete Blk No.1 Subn 2	(no CT) 8:3:37
4	Takapuwahia Blk Sec. B2	CT 247/30 15:3:14
5	Takapuwahia Blk Sec. B3	CT 240/176 12:2:15
6	Takapuwahia Blk Sec C2A3	CT 246/175 4:3:39.3
7	Takapuwahia Blk Sec. C2A2	CT 294/157 4:3:39.5
8	Takapuwahia Blk Sec. C2A1	CT 294/30 4:3:39.1
9	Takapuwahia Blk Sec. D1B	CT 239/225 27:3:20
10	Rangituhi Blk	no CT 9:0:6
11	Mahinawa Blk	CT 416 3:2:21
12	Mahinawa Blk Sec D2	no CT 3:0:0
13	Mahinawa Blk Sec E2	DT 32/49 3:0:0
14	Mahinawa Blk Sec 1C2 Pt	Ct 355/185 6:2:01

Handwritten note on file: "looks like confiscation ... approach owners carefully"

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt I]

1945 October 10 - October 18

Survey of Takapuwahia Township:

Found 26 families	64	men
	52	women
	48	boys
	<u>53</u>	girls
	217	total

98% of adults employed around Wellington

7	families living in every bad conditions
8	lodged applications for new houses
23	applications for houses altogether - 16 approved
5	houses built in 6 years

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1946 March 15 Foss Shanahan, Commissioner of Works, to Minister of Works

Says authority to be given to issue a Notice of Intention ... subject however, in respect of the block which includes a large portion of Native land, to discussion between the Minister of Native Affairs, the Native Department and the Ministry of Works.

[HD, 6/244 1]

1946 March 21 : NZ Gazette No. 16, Pg 359

A group of properties around the Ngatitooa township at Porirua were listed for taking under the Public Works Act.

1946 April 7

Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs to
Minister of Works

Will issue "proforma" objections in order to protect the rights of the owners until "the inspection and conference agreed to by Messrs Hammond and Shepherd have been carried out".

Note: R.B. Hammond was an official in the Housing Construction Division. G. Shepherd was Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1946 May 19

Notes of a Meeting at Porirua Pa 19/5/46;
Takapuwahia Block Land for Housing

List of people present:

Department]	G Shepherd	[Under-Secretary, Native
Division]	R Hammond	[Director, Housing Construction
	M R Johns	
	Mr Henshilwood	[Native Department]
	Te Rauparaha Wi Neera	
	Te Hau Ngariri	
	David Prosser	
	Jas Elkington	
	Karehana Katene	
	R Rene	
	Paeroa Wi Neera	
	N? Rei	
	Riki Wi Neera	
	Te Huru Arthur	
	Raumati Wi Neera	
	Joe Wi Neera	
	Matenga Martin	

R B Hammond outlined the proposal "Shepherd addressed [the meeting] as to the Department's interest in housing and industrialised housing and as to Maori's fitting into this scheme ... that the Native Settlement should be in keeping with the new Porirua settlement to come ... Mr Shepherd advised that the land be taken as proposed but that an area immediately behind the Marae should be held in the name of the Crown and be transferred for administration to the Native Department under the Native Housing Act".

"Mr Hammond said he would support the views of the Under-Secretary".

The proposals were explained in Maori. "The meeting accepted the proposals in a reasonable manner and no strenuous objections were evident".

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1946 July 3 Letter from the Prime Minister to S A Wiren,
Barrister and Solicitor
Copies to Minister of Works and Director of
Housing Construction

Refers to an interim reply acknowledging receipt of a Petition forwarded by the firm from members of the Ngati Toa tribe residing at Porirua and relating to the proposal to take lands for state housing.

"On the issue of the Proclamation, the matter of the taking was to be placed before the Maori people at Porirua at a General Meeting at which Messrs Shepherd and Hammond were to attend and explain the Government's proposals".

The letter notes a full explanation was given at the 19 May 1946 meeting. The Prime Minister also notes that Shepherd and Hammond were not aware at that time of the Petition, but the matter was mentioned at the meeting.

"It was, however, stated that the explanation given and the proposals which were put forward met objectives to the taking referred to in the Petition and the meeting proceeded as if the meeting were not longer of effect."

The Prime Minister states that although the meeting accepted the proposals "a further meeting will be held with the Maori people when the suggestions made by Messrs Hammond and Shepherd are developed up to a point where a definite proposal can be made.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1946 July 15 S A Wiren, H N Burns, Barristers and Solicitors to
the Prime Minister

Letter states Hammond and Shepherd did not know of the petition at the meeting and that the signatories stayed away because they felt they had already lodged their views through the petition. The signatories had instructed their lawyers to act and did not authorise anyone to speak on their behalf. They were not aware the meeting was held and that this applied to most principal owners on the lands under Proclamation.

Since the letter to the Prime Minister, the firm had met with Hammond and Shepherd and the Te Hiko, Rene and Manunui families and Mrs Wi Neera. The proposals made at the meeting were general and suggested when more detail had been prepared there should be another meeting with the petitions.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1948 April 28 Henshilwood [Native Affairs] to Under-Secretary
of Native Affairs

Noted that no further progress made since May 1946. Prosser's land purchased "officers concerned appreciate the position with regard to these lands and will move discreetly".

1948 April 28 (Cont'd)

"Your views regarding the vesting of an area behind the Pa are known, although it is desired that the Maori subdivision should fall into line, as to housing, roading layout, drainage etc, with the general scheme.

There is no question I take it that any substantial owner such as Raumati Paraone of Takapuwahia D1A2A of 16 acres will be able to obtain sections in the subdivision (and have prior right to selection) and in addition receive sufficient compensation to erect (or substantially pay for) houses thereon.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1948 December 10 Henshilwood [Maori Affairs] to Under-Secretary
Maori Affairs Porirua
Land including Takapuwahia Maori Township
and Porirua Pa

Note Prosser's land has been acquired and the rest in abeyance.

"Proposals made by Mr Shepherd were that a block of some 100 to 200 acres should be set aside at the back of (west) of the Township sections and be vested in the Crown for administration by this Department for the Maori people - sections would then be available for the housing of the present and future Maori population. Those who received compensation for their interests would presumably have the right to acquire the freehold and build under the Housing Act and others would acquire houses built on sections by our organisation, on a rental basis.

On the understanding that such an area was set aside, a meeting of the people in 19/5/46 indicated that owners would agree.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1949 June 8 Registrar MLC to Under-Secretary Maori Affairs

The Registrar notes he has been making enquiries to the Land Purchase Office, Ministry of Works about the possibility of finding land for general Maori housing in Wellington.

The District Land Purchase Officer along with Mr Dudding of the District Office, Housing Construction Branch, suggested land in the vicinity of Porirua Township. The Housing Construction Division noted it would be willing to build for general Maori housing purposes and suggested the land should be taken under the Maori Housing Act not the Public Works Act.

Noted that the following lands had been taken and compensation awarded:

1949 June 8 (Cont'd)

Takapuwahia E1	60:3:16 acres
Takapuwahia H2	39:3:27
Takapuwahia H3	14:3:38
Takapuwahia H4	214:2:0
Urukaika	25:1:17.1
Mahinawa 1C1	1:0:0
Takapuwahia E2	3:0:0
Takapuwahia H1	25:0:0

[MA1, 5/5/59, Pt 1]

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1949 October 3 Memo from Registrar MLC to Director of Housing Construction, Ministry of Works: owners of Takapuwahia D, Sec. 2. have expressed a desire that it should be subdivided into housing sites

... "This land comes within the proposed Porirua development area ... expect the Court will deal with the application early January 1950."

1949 October 20 Director of Housing Construction to District Supervisor Housing Construction Division, Wellington

Note that it was not desirable to have a concentration of Maoris in the [Porirua and Pa] area.

[Wai 60 Report - no reference]

1949 December 6 W Herewini, Maori Welfare Officer, Maori Affairs to Mr Hiko Toa

Mr Toa is part owner (20/57) Takapuwahia D No. 1A2B Block. Maori Affairs is pressing for him to indicate whether he objects to the proclamation and if he does not whether he wishes compensation or will exchange the land for certain Crown land near the block in question.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1949 December 14 Memo from Under-Secretary, Maori Affairs to Director of Housing Construction

Enclosed a signed agreement from Mr Hiko Toa one of the owners of Takapuwahia D1A2B Block, together with copy of a memorandum from my welfare officer at Hastings intimating the consent of another owner.

"It cannot be said that full consent has been obtained since there is one other owner deceased in respect of whose interest no agreement has been reached. In the circumstances, however, there seems no reason why proclamation cannot proceed".

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1950 June 18 Notes of Meeting at Takapuwahia Pa, Sunday, 18 June 1950 at 2.30 pm

About 60 representatives of Ngati Toa plus T T Ropiha, Under-Secretary, Maori Affairs, Mrs Ropiha, Messrs J McEwen, F B Katene and A G Hercus, from the Department of Maori Affairs.

D Prosser welcomed visitors. Ropiha stated that he had come to discuss three matters including the proposal to take land for the railway on the foreshore and "the question of roading and developing land near the Pa" for Maori Housing purposes.

Mr Joe Rene stated: "about 1880, if the tribal elders decided to divide up the sections around here to enable the people to stay together here on the lands handed down to them. Even after 60 years the Ngati Toa still live here. My desire is to see that after generations will have a properly planned place to live in."

Mr Ropiha: I think the best plan for the land would be for the Department to buy the whole block and develop it in stages for Maori housing reserving the bush. We could form, say, 10 chains of roading and when these sections are taken up do a further 10 chains of road.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1952 December 15 Memo from Commissioner of Works to Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs

Land north and south of the Porirua township developed at considerable cost - now need to increase economies of scale by bringing in usable land in Maori ownership.

"A roading layout plan for land behind the Maori village was prepared by the Town Planning Section of the Ministry of Works some years ago, but it appears that no more has been made to acquire the land or develop it for the settlement of Maori ex-servicemen and others".

Wishes to know whether Maori Affairs will support and assist the acquisition of land.

Handwritten note on memo "Examine its effect on our own scheme originally sponsored by Housing Branch of Works" Ropiha 16/12/52.

[MA1, 5/5/59 Pt 1]

1953 February 13 Memo to Under-Secretary Maori Affairs on Porirua Village

Two issues noted:

1. Ministry of Works proposal to take land.
2. Refusal of Makara County Council to issue any more building permits until the roads are legalised and formed to State Housing settlement standards.

1953 February 23 (Cont'd)

Land in question was where owners wanted the Department to take over and subdivide for Maori housing. No doubt owners will oppose taking but Maori Trustee unable to afford to purchase the whole area and hold it indefinitely for Maori housing. "The solution may be to let the Works Department develop the whole area and earmark definite areas for Maori housing needs - either for purchase or rental by Maoris.

The issue of the roads was serious - population at the Pa is increasing rapidly. Council's requirements were seen as too stringent and therefore restricting the building of houses - suggestion that the Under-Secretary discuss modification of standards.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1953 February 19 **Memo from Under-Secretary Maori Affairs to Commissioner of Works "Maori Land for Housing - Porirua"**

After discussions with the "Porirua People" they want the Department to purchase part of the area behind the village for Maori housing sites. Matter under investigation.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1953 March 23 **Assistant District Officer, Maori Affairs to Under-Secretary Maori Affairs - proposal for purchase of Maori Land at Takapuwahia for Group Maori Housing Scheme**

Area included:

Takapuwahia	D1A2A & D1A2B	16:2:22.5
Rangituhi Block		8:2:12
Pt Takapuwahia	D1B2, 3 & 4	27:2:19.6
Takapuwahia	D1A1A	6:3:32.2
Takapuwahia	D1A13	21 acres

Land inspected by Minister of Maori Affairs, the Under-Secretary and D Prosser on behalf of Maori residents. Decided to get valuations for a proposal. Thirty-nine acres was seen as suitable for housing. Plan provided by Director of Housing Construction to the Under-Secretary showing how the area could be roaded to suit proposed adjoining Crown Land.

Cost of servicing roading £375 per section with 30 residents needing housing at present.

Recommended that the Board of Maori Affairs approve the scheme under Sections 2 and 3 of the Maori Housing Amendment Act 1938.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1953 June 11 File note on Proposed Housing Scheme

Notes criticism of:

- estimated development costs - likely to be beyond income of the Maori residents.
- partitioning going on and buildings going up that would make the group scheme difficult.

Recommended that a scheme plan be drawn up and only then would the Under-Secretary consider recommending the proposal to the Board. Whether the area in question should be purchased and used as a Maori housing settlement or whether it would be more economical to hand the land over to the State Housing and receive in exchange an equivalent number of sections for Maori applicants scattered throughout the area.

[MA1, 5/5/59]

1953 October 20 Mr Henshilwood, Wellington District Office,
Maori Affairs, to District Supervisor, Housing
Division, Ministry of Works

Requests costings for house sites on some 40 acres of a block of Maori land immediately behind the Porirua Pa township.

[MA1 5/5/59]

1953 November 11 Mr Henshilwood, Wellington District Office,
Maori Affairs to Head Office, Maori Affairs

Lists problems associated with the Department attempting a development.

- Likely cost per section around £600
- Large number of sections likely and will take a long time to recoup costs from Maori applicants
- Some doubt that there were necessary funds available to complete the [development] scheme under the Maori Housing Act 1938 - would reduce amount available for actual houses. Maori Trustee unlikely to be able to fund the scheme (up to £80,000 required).

"Apart from the cost, the question of reserving all this land for Maori housing should be considered as a matter of policy. In the Panmure area, many sections of which were reserved for the local Maoris, the sections were allocated in groups of three only, it being contended that there was a danger of segregating the Maori's into one area and a form of "Chinatown" being created.

- Because of cost unlikely to be developed by Maori Affairs alone.

1953 November 11 (Cont'd)

- Suggested Crown acquire the land outlined in the Board Subdivision - 27 March 1953, plus other adjacent lands "provided that a certain number of sections here and there be reserve for those Maori applicants who can afford to buy them".
- "If the Maori housing applicants could not afford to acquire any of the sections possibly some of them could be set aside for the Maori people, and these be leased by the Crown in perpetuity, in which case loans would be available under the Maori Housing Act".
- Question of vesting roads in the Township to be looked at separately.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1953 December No date: handwritten dates on page reads 11/12/53
- Note on file to Mr Blane [Maori Affairs]
"Porirua Pa Roothing"

Makara County refused to look after roads until they are brought up to standard.

Handwritten additions to the memo state: "So far as this Dept is concerned the proposed purchase and subdivision scheme seems to be beyond our financial capacity even if (which has not been established) there is a reasonable need for it ...

It is fairly cleared that the main thing to be done is to square up the existing settlement area as far as roads and other services are concerned".

Further file note: "The Min[ister] is anxious that 4 or 5 Maori sections totalling some 100 acres should be purchased, rooded and serviced for disposal to any Maori either by purchase or accepting a leasehold interest" - not able to help with the rooding issue.

[MA1, 5/5/59 1]

1954 February 17 District Commissioner, Ministry of Works to
Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs

Advises that the Housing Division wish to acquire more land for State Housing purposes:

- Takapuwahia B1, B2 and B3
- Popoteruru

"Only part of the land was suitable for subdivision but the rest could be used as reserve."

**1954 September 7 Commissioner of Works to Under-Secretary of
Maori Affairs**

Refers to Conference between the Department and the Ministry of Works and stated need for a meeting about the Porirua land.

"You also thought that it would go some way towards meeting the Maoris objections to the loss of their ancestral land if they were allowed to acquire sections in the proposed housing subdivision at market value, having regard to the cost of roading and other services.

This Department agrees in principle to this suggestion".

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

**1955 March Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs to the Minister
of Maori Affairs**

Noted looked at getting land for Maori Housing through Maori Affairs - Maori at the pa opposed to sale except for Maori housing.

Thought could get about 47 sections from:

Takapuwahia D1B2, 3 and 4

Takapuwahia D1A1A

Takapuwahia D1A1B

Takapuwahia D1A2A

Takapuwahia DL1A2B

but would not need to take them all at once.

"Even at current market value it is unlikely that there would be an early demand from Maori for all the sites, and the use of all of them for Maori would represent an undesirable concentration in the area. It is therefore proposed that the sections be disposed of for housing purposes in the normal way at current market value and that 30 sections disposed throughout the Porirua Basin generally be set aside for Maori.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

**1955 March 18 Wellington District Officer, Maori Affairs to Head
Office**

Agrees with 30 sections be requested to be set aside by the Housing Division.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

**1955 March 4 Under-Secretary Maori Affairs to Minister of
Maori Affairs**

Argues for 100 sections based on the needs of the total Maori population - later altered to 125 sections.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1955 June 15 Wellington District Officer, Dept of Maori Affairs to Wellington District Commissioner of Works, Ministry of Works re: Takapuwahia B1, B2 and B3 and Popoteruru Blocks

Meetings of owners not called. "Those that could be located were advised by special notice (16/3/54) of the Crown's desire to buy the land. Several objections were noted to you by memo (29/4/54). If the Crown wanted to take the land regardless of objections, it should inform the known owners and gazette the intentions."

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1955 June 26 From? to Minister of Housing; re. Takapuwahia B1, B2, B3 and Popoteruru Blocks

Recommend Crown acquires land for housing.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1955 June 28 Commissioner of Works to Secretary of Maori Affairs

Minister of Housing has agreed to 20-25 sites per year over 5 years to be provided - to be scattered through Porirua. Maori Affairs to collaborate with the Ministry of Works to obtain land.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1955 July 26 Commissioner of Works to Minister of Housing

"After discussions with D Prosser of Porirua at various times he said that the majority of landowners would agree to proclamation."

Reiterates the possibility of sections in the Porirua area - up to 20.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1955 August? Maori Affairs Department to Housing Construction Division requesting 10 sections for Maori use in the development

Housing Construction Division refuse because not enough sections in area.

[HDL, 3/211/10]

1955 October 7 Minister of Housing to Commissioner of Works

Minister of Housing directs that some should be made available but did not occur.

[HD1, 3/211/10]

1956 April 13 File Note

Note on file that Ministry of Works now want Takapuwahia C2A1B1 and that the Department of Land and Survey is becoming tired of the piecemeal approach.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1958 July 9 District Commissioner of Works to District Supervisor, Housing Construction Division, Ministry of Works; re. Proposed Housing Development Behind Porirua Pa and Encroachment Behind Mana College

Since 1957 several unsuccessful attempts to encourage Maori owners to sell to the Crown. Recent encroachment by Mana College on the land now seen as arrogant trespass. Owners definitely opposed to selling.

It is understood that the attitude of the Maoris is that they should keep the land available for the growing population of the Maori settlement as Porirua. Their concern is for the future - say 30 or 40 years here and not for the immediate needs for today.

The time appears opportune to reconsider future policy in regard to the acquisition of this land. Reiterating the remarks of the Land Purchase Officer made in his memo to you of 9/10/56 - I feel that little progress will be made in acquiring this land unless the whole of the area is proclaimed.

[MA 1, 5/5/59 2]

1958 August 7 File Note

The Minister of Maori Affairs approved in principle the negotiations for the land [Takapuwahia B1, B2, B3 and Popoteruru] but the Ministry of Works now want 80 acres.

[MA 1, 5/5/59 2]

1958 September 9 Handwritten note on Memo re. charging of rates on land at Porirua from M R Jones, District Officer, Maori Affairs to the Secretary, Head Office

"I recommend that action should go ahead by the Ministry of Works to issue Notice of Intention to acquire under the P.W. Act.

The owners (many of them) are known to me as quite capable to place their business in the hands of Solicitors to protect their interest in the matter of compensation to be paid to them.

[MA1, 5/5/59 2]

1958 October 3 Note on File

The Crown has searched the following for possible acquisition:

Takapuwahia C1A
Takapuwahia C1C Pt
Takapuwahia C1C1
Takapuwahia C1C3
Takapuwahia C1C4
Takapuwahia C2A1 A1
Takapuwahia C2A1 B
Takapuwahia C2A2

1958 October 3 (Cont'd)

Takapuwahia C2B
Takapuwahia D1A2A
Takapuwahia D1A1B
Takapuwahia D1 B Pt
Takapuwahia D1 B
Takapuwahia A 5th 2
Rangituhu

[MA 1, 5/5/59 2]

1958 December 5 Report from Secretary, Housing Construction, Ministry of Works to Minister of Maori Affairs; re: Maori Land for Housing Purposes at Porirua

1. For a number of years, proposals in one form or another have been under consideration by the Housing Construction Division for the use, for housing purposes, of the Maori land lying at the back of the Porirua Pa.
4. Attention is again being focused on the area. The land lies immediately behind the Maori village overlooking the Porirua Harbour and runs into the hills. The District Valuer, who earlier reported on the area, stated that the situation was excellent. The front

Pa Area

13. There has been a suggestion that the owners of the land at Porirua may wish to retain it so that it can be available for Maoris wanting sections for housing. It is questionable whether this proposition has much to commend it. The Pa area (Takapuwahia Township), where most of the Maori houses are, is not a striking example of planned subdivision. The aggregation of further Maori families in or about the Pa area is really against policy. It is much better that sections should be available to Maoris throughout the various state housing ...
15. The application of a remedy to the existing state in the Pa is something which will take a deal of working out. While that can proceed independently of the development of the back area, it is not wholly unrelated to the latter. In these circumstances, it is suggested that you approve the adoption of a policy under which no further applications for advances for Maori houses in the Pa should be entertained until final utilisation plans for the area have been settled.

Recommendations

16. It is recommended that you approve:
- (a) the taking under Public Works Act, 1928, of the properties ... [includes C2A3]
 - (b) ... [negotiate for some blocks]
 - (c) the adoption of a policy under which no further application for advances for Maori houses in the Pa should be entertained.

1959 February 23 M R Jones, Liaison Officer, Maori Affairs, to
Minister of Maori Affairs re. Maori Land for
Housing at Porirua

States:

- "1. I was in the thick of the negotiations when Waiwhetu land were taken under the PWA for housing. Waiwhetu Maori settlement was in a worse position than Porirua Pa is today.
2. The approval for taking was given by Mr Longstone and later negotiations providing houses for resident owners was taken up by Mr Mason.
3. Waiwhetu, if strong action had not been taken would now be a real eye sore.
4. I would recommend strong action in the case of Porirua to the point of agreeing to the lands being taken as recommended by the Department with safeguards for provision of homes for any owner who wants a home.
5. I am satisfied this would be the only way Porirua Pa will get properly formed streets, up-to-date sanitation and water supply.

[MA1, 5/5/59 3]

1959 File Note: Maori Land for Housing

The land at the pa is noted as:

- Involving a total area of 162 acres - 20 titles.
- Pa not well planned or developed - without sewerage and has no proper roading or water supply. "Attitude of the Council is that nothing will be done until rates are paid and of the owners that no rates will be paid until something is done."
- Development of the new area would improve access to existing houses, as well as water supply and services. "One house of inferior quality would probably have to be removed - some sections affected by portions needed for access."

1959 File Note: (Cont'd)

Proposed use of land: "To avoid undue concentration of Maoris in the area and at the same time make available sections badly needed for housing, it is proposed that the land when taken be available for housing generally, and not exclusively for Maoris. It is expected that subdivision would produce about 125 housing sections, and a corresponding number of house sites would be made available to Maoris in other areas in and around Wellington".

- Proposed no applications for advances for houses in the Pa be entertained "meantime" in order not to create more difficulties for the larger scheme.
- Reason for compulsory acquisition "adopted simply because of difficulties of proceeding by negotiation with a large number of owners".

[MA15/5/59 3]

1959 April 30 Note for file: Secretary Maori Affairs, re. Maori Land for Housing at Porirua Claims by Porirua Maoris for Compensation Regarding Damage to Shellfish Beds

- Minister of Maori Affairs and Minister of Works visited Porirua 28 April in connection with acquiring land.
- Received at Porirua Marae - local speakers referred to shellfish beds damaged by Public Works.
- Walter Nash replied that he would address issue but that he was there to discuss the housing section.
- Ministers examined land accompanied by Mr George Katene and "one of the Rene family who said that she owned Lot D1A2A."
- If land is taken should be prompt settlement of compensation.
- "We would hope that in developing the area for housing purposes if it is taken, there would be consequential benefits for the township area in which many houses have been erected for and on behalf of the Local Maoris."
- Servicing the back area would mean links to "water supply, sewerage and so on".
- "If this improvement comes about as the result of Crown activities, it would, I think, be appropriate for Government to suggest that it could be regarded as a fair offset to any damage to shellfish supplies. In suggesting such a notional offset, it would be necessary to be careful to say that claims regarding shellfish damage were not admitted, if the latter were the opinion, but at the same time to say that the offset could be regarded as a reasonable way of looking at the thing."

1959 September 17

District Comm. of Works to Chief Surveyor, Lands and Survey Dept;
re. Land for Housing: Maori Blocks behind Porirua Pa. Ministerial
approval has been obtained to acquisition [and taking] of certain
Maori-owned land [plan PWD 27694 (HDW 31429)]. Please arrange for
the plan needed to initiate legislation action ...

1959?

**Draft letter to Mrs Takiari, 27 Broderick Road,
Johnsonville from Acting Minister of Maori
Affairs**

Sets out justifications for taking lands.

- Closer settlement in the Porirua Basin and Takapuwhia Pa is becoming surrounded ["by European settlement" crossed out] and not practicable to continue entirely undisturbed and unchanged as a Pa.
- In order to provide suitable housing for Maoris and Europeans proposed to cut up land around the Pa - to do this effectively there is a need to take Pa lands themselves.
- Method of acquisition necessary because of the large number of owners.
- Job of filling gullies so big only the Crown could do it.
- Benefits to the Pa - improved roads, water supply and sewerage - better place to live in and more of a credit to residents than it is at present.
- Maoris around Wellington who are in need of housing will also benefit - sections equal in number to those made available to Europeans will be provided throughout the metropolitan area.

[MAL, 5/5/59 3]

1960 January 26 **Mr Simpson, Morison, Spratt, Taylor & Co, Barristers
and Solicitors to Piri Parai**

As instructed by you, we made inquiries of the Maori Land Court in regard your application to vest your interest in this block in your ten children in order to provide them with housing sites.

The position appears to be that the area of the block is five acres but that it has no road frontage, the access being by right-of-way to No.8 Street. On the plan attached to the application, it is shown that you propose to subdivide the property by extending this right-of-way along the southern boundary of the block and presumably cut the remaining area into ten equal sections by lines drawn north and south. We attach a plan showing the position. [Plan enclosed].

1960 January 26 (Cont'd)

The Court objects to this scheme on the following grounds:

1. There is no evidence to show whether the proposed scheme of partition is practicable having regard to the contour of the land. Further, there is nothing to indicate whether the sections, as shown on the scheme plan, will provide practicable housing sites.
2. None of the sections has a road frontage and it more than possible that the Makara County Council would not approve the issue of building permits until it was satisfied that practicable access to the sections was available.
3. There is nothing on the file to indicate how the sections are to be allocated among your children; that is which child takes which section.
4. In discussing the matter with the Judge, we gained the impression that he felt that your application was premature in regard to a great majority of your children, although there would not be the same objection if you confined the application to say one child who proposed to build within the near future.

Our own feeling is that because developments in the Porirua Pa area in regard to subdivision and roading are pending, it would be advisable to wait before making any definite provision for your children. If, however, one of them wishes to erect a house immediately, then we think that the Court would make a vesting order in respect of one section, but the Judge would insist on the scheme plan being prepared by a surveyor after the latter had inspected the property and satisfied himself that a practicable scheme was possible.

1960 March 10

Extract from NZ Gazette, No.16, page 326; Notice of Intention to Take Land for State Housing Purposes, under PW Act 1928. H. Watt, Minister of Works 22/2/1960.

1960 March 16 District Supervisor [?Ministry of Works?] to Director of Housing; re. Proposed Development

It is fairly steep and scrub-covered and, at present, only a small portion of it is used for housing, access mainly being obtained by rights of way off the ends of existing roads in the Pa.

For some years Maori Affairs Department has been investigating an overall scheme designed to put the area to full use.

Because of the multiple ownerships there are considerable difficulties in opening up the area; and following a meeting between the owner's representative and the Ministers of Maori Affairs and Works, it was agreed that the land should be acquired for general housing purposes and that an appropriate number of sections be made available each year in this and other parts of the Wellington District for Maori Housing purposes.

1960 March 16 (Cont'd)

The proposals for the area include extensive earthworks to provide about 350 house sites, playing fields, and other usual neighbourhood amenities.

1960 May 9 Letter from A Takiari on behalf of his mother stating that she had not been notified about the Proclamation

"What right has the Government got to build houses for the Pakeha in a Pa?"

[MA1, 5/5/59 3]

1960 May 25 LCE Malt District Commissioner of Works to the Commissioner of Works (Ministry of Works, Wgtn) 22/1/3/11 or 6-244/3, Housing Division; Memo re. Land for Housing - Porirua - Maori Blocks - Takapuwahia

Your HC [Housing Construction, MOW] 2/175B of 22/4/1960 and 13/5/1950 and minuted copy dated 29/4/1960 to Mr Takiari refers to this topic.

Notice of Intention to take 18 blocks of land was posted in NZ Gazette. Objections to 13 blocks being taken were received including one from Morison, Spratt, Taylor & Co, Solicitors for Piri Parai.

(16) General Comments

- (a) In the Prime Minister's memorandum to the Minister of Works dated 12 June 1959 reference is made to a joint inspection which was carried out during the meeting held at the Pa at Porirua on 23 April 1960. The meeting was convened by the Department of Maori Affairs but that Department has advised that an invitation to attend was not extended to Maori owners although several Maori residents were present. Complaints that they were unaware of the meeting have been voiced by several objecting owners.
- (b) It is expected that 125 sections will emerge from the land proposed to be taken and that a like number of sections in other State subdivisions will go to Maoris. Complaints have also been voiced that these 125 sections will not necessarily benefit the dispossessed owners or their relatives or descendants as it is proposed to make the sections available to any member of the Maori race irrespective of his family ties or place of origin.
- (c) The District Supervisor considers that with the exception of Takapuwahia C1C5 (paragraph 4) none of the lands set out in the Notice of Intention could be excluded from the Proclamation without serious interference to the proposed scheme of development; all are required in connection with the general reshaping of the land.

1960 July 14 District Superintendent to Acting Secretary, Maori Affairs

Noted that a meeting was held with owners on 23 March 1960. Parai objected (to proposal) and that an invitation to attend the meeting was not given to the owners.

[MA1, 5/5/59 3]

1960 July 14 District Supervisor, Ministry of Works to Acting Sec., Maori Affairs; Reply to memo of 6 July 1960

To develop the land sanitary sewage and stormwater drains must pass through the Pa area. Water mains may pass through the Pa. Roads in the Pa area may be improved.

"All of these factors would, in my opinion, result in adventitious improvements to the Pa area ..."

1960 September 15

Extract from NZ Gazette, No.59, page 1433; Land Taken for State Housing Purposes in Block 1, Belmont Survey District, H Watt, Minister of Includes Takapuwahia C2A4 4:3:39.3 acres.

Section 7

This section tries to explain the passage of events between the first sign of government interest in the land at Porirua for housing and the taking of the land under the Public Works Act in 1960.

The period was very complex in terms of what happened and what was proposed for the land. Two themes emerged:

- ⇒ the wish by the government to acquire the land for its mainstream housing scheme at Porirua.
- ⇒ the wish of the Maori landowners to both improve their housing conditions while retaining their land in Maori ownership.

In March 1943, the Director of Housing Construction, R B Hammond reported to the Minister of Housing that a decision had been made to proceed with a large-scale state housing development in the Wellington area. This was to be the next stage in the Labour government's state housing programme after the major developments at Naenae and Kilbernie in Wellington, and Orakei in Auckland. Similar developments were envisaged at Tamaki/Pt England in Auckland. Both schemes were to be on a massive scale, particularly the Porirua development, fully planned and at first provided with all facilities.

Land supplies were drying up at a time when war time restrictions on state house construction were beginning to ease. The government was keen to secure large areas of land and to avoid the inflation of land prices. Initially, the Housing Department had looked at a possible scheme in the Hutt Valley but this had proved impracticable and attention had turned to the Porirua/Titahi Bay area.

Hammond advised the Minister of Housing that the Directorate was interested in the Tawa Flat and Titahi Bay district for a major scheme. He also advised that a notice of intention to take the land under the Public Works Act should be issued over a large area with details on what to do with the land to be decided after that had been done. In effect the Directorate was setting up a system of 'land banking' via the Public Works Act, of land which it had identified as being needed for future housing use.

The Maori land behind the Porirua Pa was identified at the outset as necessary to the scheme. In December 1944, the Department of Maori Affairs was informed that the Takapuwhia Blocks among other blocks was wanted for housing. David Prosser had offered a large area of land for sale and the land around it was necessary if it was to be developed economically. In February 1945, the Takapuwhia Blocks including Takapuwhia C2A3 were specifically noted as being needed. "This proposed scheme of housing is of major proportions and will comprehensively include most suitable building land in

the area. To omit Native owned sections within the scheme would seriously upset the proper planning and economy of development where such native sections are situated" (6 February 1946). At this stage the Under-secretary of Maori Affairs noted that the process looked like confiscation and that there was a need to proceed carefully.

In March 1946, a Notice of Intention to take was gazetted for a number of properties around the Ngatitua township. At this stage the Department of Maori Affairs was taking a facilitation role in the process of ensuring that the owners received adequate compensation. Takapuwahia C2A3 was not included in the gazetting because the Housing Division was to proceed on a piecemeal basis to acquire the total area.

A meeting was held on 19 May 1946 at Porirua Pa with Hammond from the Housing Construction Division and George Shepherd from Maori Affairs. At that meeting it was proposed that as part of the acquisition process a portion of the land taken be set aside and transferred to the Maori Affairs Department for administration and development under the Native Housing Act. The 1938 Native Housing Amendment Act had recognised the problem of organising improved housing on a "planned" basis on scattered land holdings and provided for group housing schemes. In effect, the proposal would have meant the alienation of a large area of land but by implication provided for a compact improved settlement capable of being serviced at a reasonable cost.

The meeting was reported as agreeing to the proposal but it later emerged that some landowners had already petitioned against the Notice of Intention prior to the meeting. This group appears to have reserved judgement on the proposal until more details were made available. What their final conclusion is has not been discovered and the original petition has not been identified.

The motives behind the proposal appear to have been two-fold. First, there was some acceptance on the part of government officials that compensation would involve access to specific housing resources as well as the opportunity for cash compensation. This was consistent with events at Orakei and Waiwhetu which were occurring at the same time. In both cases, the land wanted was around a traditional settlement and it was recognised that there were particular rights to reside on that land. This brokering of a solution that recognised the concentration of Maori around the pa was to be at odds with later policies.

The second motive was to respond to ongoing pressure for improved housing in the area. Two surveys - one in 1931 and the other in 1945 - had revealed housing problems at the pa although commentators felt conditions were relatively good compared with the other areas. During the 1930s residents had looked to Native Department for improved housing. The proposal for a scheme under the Native Housing Act did mean that it differed from the proposals at Waiwhetu and Orakei in that they were directly serviced by the Housing Branch and the State Advances. The degree to which these proposals

were seen as "compensation" and the degree to which they were a response to poor housing is not clear.

In December 1948 Shepherd's scheme was summarised as providing approximately 100 to 200 acres for development for Maori housing behind the existing township. Those who received adequate compensation for their interest would receive a freehold section and have a right to build under the Native Housing Act. Others would be provided with rental housing built by the Maori Affairs Department. This split between freehold and rental was similar to the Waiwhetu agreement. In effect, it appears that the land itself would be provided without cost - assuming that the cash compensation covered the full loss of the land.

A complicating factor appeared in June 1949 when the Maori Land Court Registrar made general enquiries about the availability of land for general Maori housing - presumably for new urban Maori arrivals. At this stage, the Housing Construction Division suggested that the housing be located on land near Porirua township (the Pa) and that the Branch build the houses. The Registrar also appears to have been approached by occupants of one of the Takapuwhia Blocks to have the land subdivided for housing. It was noted that the land was being considered for a development scheme and no action was taken.

In October 1949, Hammond, noted to the Wellington District Supervisor, Housing Construction Division, that it was not desirable to have a concentration of Maori in the [Porirua and Pa] area. It is not clear whether this statement refers to the issue of other Maori living in the area and is a response to the Maori Land Court Registrar's enquiries or whether it refers to the proposed township housing scheme under the Native Housing Act as well. If it refers only to the former then this is still consistent with the government's initiatives at both Orakei, and Waiwhetu for tribal Maori while marking a growing distancing from the idea of concentrations of urban Maori. If it refers to the latter then this is a significant shift away from the earlier proposal that was agreed to in 1946.

By June 1950, another meeting was held at the pa which discussed among other things the question of improvements to the area; T T Ropiha, the Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs, referred to the housing proposal. Now he appeared to be taking the position that the Department should buy "the whole block and develop it in stages for Maori housing, reserving the bush". There appears at this point to have been a shift away from the idea that the housing scheme, was in part a response to the state housing scheme and the proposal to take the land. Now it appeared that the scheme was entirely an initiative of the Maori Affairs Department. The implied provision of the land (10 December 1948) in addition to cash payments to landowners also seems to have been lost.

Further evidence in this changed thinking is found in a memo from the

Commissioner of Works to the Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs in December 1952. The memo noted that the land taken previously under the Public Works Act and that bought from Prosser had been developed. Now there was a need to increase economies of scale by bringing in usable land in Maori ownership. The memo referred to a previous scheme to buy land behind the village for Maori ex-servicemen and others and a plan prepared by the town planning section of the Ministry of Works. The Commissioner now wanted to know if the Maori Affairs would help with acquisition of the land for mainstream housing.

There is no indication that the initial proposal to develop the whole of the area (as indicated in 1943) had ever been formally abandoned. Indeed, evidence suggests otherwise - that the government always intended such a development but approached it on a piecemeal basis. The changing attitudes to the Maori Housing Scheme therefore must be seen as a failure by government officials in charge of the mainstream housing programme to remember and provide for the original agreement made in 1946. This is noted in Ropiha's comments on the memo to "examine its effects (the further acquisition of land) on our own scheme originally sponsored by Housing Branch of Works".

From this period the Maori Housing scheme promoted by the Maori Affairs Department and the proposal to acquire more land for mainstream state housing under the Public Works Act seem to have proceeded down parallel sometimes intersecting paths - a situation of great confusion and no doubt frustration for the landowners.

Throughout 1953 the Maori Affairs Department pursued the possibility of a housing scheme under the Native Housing Act. In February 1953, it noted that the Ministry of Works also wanted the land and that Makara County Council had stated that it would not issue any more building permits in the area until formed roads to state housing settlement standards were created. It was clear that the owners opposed the taking of land and wanted it used for their own improved housing but the Maori Trustee had insufficient funds to afford to purchase the area and hold it for future development. If this had been done it may have forestalled the taking of the land under the Public Works Act. A compromise was suggested - to allow the Ministry of Works to take most of the land and to earmark certain portions for Maori housing needs.

The roads issue was also seen as serious and recalls old debates about the standards required of Maori housing settlements. Makara County Council had similar motives to the Ministry of Works in that it wanted to ensure that the township did not stand out as separate from and therefore undermine the major proposed new settlement.

The Department pursued the proposed February 1953 solution through 1953 identifying a possible 39 acres for retention and looking at the land

development costs. In March the Department's Wellington Branch Assistant District Officer estimated that a plan provided by the Housing Construction Department would cost about £375 per section to develop. He recommended approval by the Board of Maori Affairs under the 1938 Amendment Act. This proposal was criticised internally on the grounds that the costs were likely to be beyond the owners ability to pay and that partitioning of land was still going on that undermined the scheme.

In June, Departmental officers continued to have doubts about a scheme around the Pa and recommended the land be handed over to the Ministry of Works with an equivalent number of sections being provided scattered throughout the area. Further costings were obtained from the Ministry of Works who stated that land development costs were more realistically around £600. Henshilwood from the Wellington District Office noted other issues:

- ⇒ with the large number of sections the taking up of land by Maori owners would be likely to be slow;
- ⇒ not enough funds available under the 1938 Act and the Maori Trustee did not have enough money to pay out the needed £80,000 without a faster take up by the landowners.
- ⇒ the land costs would leave little aside for new housing.

Henshilwood went on to support the approach of Crown acquisition and development with sections provided for Maori "who can afford to buy them" - presumably from compensation payments. He suggested that if the owners could not afford to buy back the land that the Crown lease the land back in perpetuity in which case loans would be available under the Maori Housing Act.

Under the proposal the land would be taken and compensation paid on the value of the land but this would be insufficient for the owners to be able to buy back the developed land. It is very clear example of the impacts of a community starved of capital sufficient to develop their land and house themselves. Moreover, the specialised Maori Housing Act, passed to try and address this issue was also starved of resources. The need to acquire the land via the Department of Maori Affairs in order to develop it is also typical of the problems faced by Maori generally during the period, particularly the inability to obtain capital for development.

The governments assimilationist policies (pepper potting) also began to have an impact on the land owners. In his memo in June 1953 Henshilwood noted ... "Apart from the cost, the question of reserving all this land for Maori housing should be considered as a matter of policy. In the Panmure (Tamaki) area, many sections of which were reserved for the local Maoris, the sections were allocated in groups of three only, it being contended that there was a danger of segregating the Maoris into one area and a form of "Chinatown"

being created". This is the first clear and unambiguous application of the pepper-potting principle to the Ngatitua at Takapuwahia.

In early 1954, the Ministry of Works reiterated its desire to acquire more land for state housing purposes - although some of it would be used for reserves rather than housing. In September the Commissioner of Works noted a conference that had been held between Works and Maori Affairs where it was suggested that the objections of the owners "to the loss of their ancestral land" might be forestalled if they were "allowed to acquire sections in the proposed housing subdivision at market value". He noted his agreement to this proposal. In March 1955, the Department of Maori Affairs seems to have finally abandoned the original proposal of a scheme under the 1938 Native Housing Amendment Act - on the grounds that there would be insufficient demands for a large number of sections under the scheme because of the market values. A further reason for abandonment was the undesirability of concentrations of Maori in the area. A suggested 30 sections would be set aside for purchase at market value - scattered throughout the Porirua Basin. This decision is significant for the following reasons:

- ⇒ Any notion of compensation/accommodation of the landowners for their loss of land as proposed under the original scheme had now disappeared. Thus because of the long drawn out nature of the land development process the proposals which were similar in nature and intent to the Orakei and Waiwhetu schemes had been lost.
- ⇒ The component of the original scheme that had tried to overcome the problems of shortage of capital under the Native Housing Act had now disappeared.
- ⇒ The expectations that the land owners should be located around the pa had also been lost.

The proposed 30 sites was recommended to be increased to 125 sites by the Under-Secretary of Maori Affairs and this was negotiated with the Ministry of Works and agreed to on 28 June 1955. It was also noted that the Maori Affairs would collaborate in the acquisition of the land. Meanwhile the Maori Affairs Department had resumed its earlier role of facilitating the acquiring land under the Public Works Act - informing the Ministry of Works that as many owners of Takapuwahia B1, B2 and B3 and Popoteruru Blocks as possible had been contacted. No meeting was held but it recommended that if the Ministry wished to acquire the land it should gazette its intentions.

There was little progress made on the acquisition of these blocks between late 1955 and late 1958 - except that the Ministry now signalled it wanted to acquire Takapuwahia C2A21B1 (to the irritation of the Department of Lands and Survey). The Ministry of Works seems to have wanted to acquire the land via purchase during this time but owners were adamant that the land would be used for their own housing needs. The encroachment of the new

Mana College onto some of the land seems to have further incensed the owners. As the Ministry realised that opposition to sale had hardened it finally adopted the position that the whole area be proclaimed. This included by implication Takapuwahia C2A3. This slowness in developing the identified area meant, of course, any solution to improved housing at the pa was delayed.

In 1958, a further group of titles were searched (3 October 1958). A report was prepared by the Ministry of Works on the land in December 1958. The report takes the position that any further building of houses on land around the Pa should not be allowed to proceed. "The Pa area (Takapuwahia Township) where most of the Maori houses are, is not a striking example of planned subdivision. The aggregation of further Maori families in or about the Pa area is really against policy. It is much better that sections should be available to Maoris throughout the various state housing (areas)". The report confirmed the availability of the 125 sections. It also sought agreement to taking the land under the Public Works Act and an end to any advances from Maori Affairs or the State Advances Corporation for housing on the land. Such developments were seen as undermining the wider scheme - and also adding to an area that would be seen as an eyesore in relation to the proposed new development.

This report which summarises the scheme developed over the previous four years is notable for its emphasis on the state of the pa as a reason for not proceeding with further improvements and for concentrations of Maori in the area (see also "File notes" 1959).

By mid 1959, however, discussions seem to have concentrated on the fact that the surrounding state housing development would help improve the township through the provision of water supply and drainage systems rather than the 125 sections. A meeting was held between Walter Nash and the land owners to discuss a number of issues including the housing question. Nash noted that he hoped the taking of the land would result in these improvements.

In September 1959, Ministerial approval was gained for the taking of the lands. In a draft letter to one of the owners who objected the Acting Minister of Maori Affairs noted that "closer settlement in the Porirua Basin and Takapuwahia Pa is becoming surrounded (*"by European settlement"* and *subsequently crossed out*) and not practicable to continue entirely undisturbed and unchanged as a Pa". It was noted that the method of acquisition was necessary because of the large number of owners. The township would benefit from improvements - to roads etc "while Maoris in Wellington who are in need of housing will also benefit - sections equal in number to those made available to Europeans will be provided throughout the metropolitan area".

The 125 sections that had been proposed for the landowners in response to their needs seemed to have metamorphosed into a general provision for Maori throughout the region. Undoubtedly the Department of Maori Affairs had

been arguing for more sections to be made available generally but there is not indication that it saw the using of sections made available to Takapuwahia as being a solution.

In January 1960, Piri Parai, owner of C2A3, applied to the Maori Land Court to partition the land for his children. This was refused by the Court on a number of grounds not least because of the impending improvements to the township.

The notice of intention to proceed to take the land was gazetted on 10 March 1960. In a memo from the Commissioner of Works to the Minister of Works an inspection of the site was referred to that took place on 23 April 1960. No landowners were involved. [No record has been obtained of this meeting]. The memo noted that 13 objections to the Notice of Intention had been made, including by Parai, and that in particular there were objections to the fact that the 125 sections would not be made available to the dispossessed. This shift of the benefits to the general Maori population as a specific response to the taking of the land is ironic in that by the early 1960s the Maori pool system was beginning to breakdown with Maori beginning to gain general access to state housing. The question as to whether the 125 sections did go into the Maori pool either as state houses or as available sections for Maori applicants still remains to be clarified.

The Maori Affairs Department sought reassurances that the township would benefit in some way from the state housing development around it. This was given in June 1960.

Conclusion

The various housing schemes proposed at Takapuwahia/Porirua Pa were a response both to the taking of land under the Public Works Act and, to a lesser degree the housing problems of landowners. There are undoubted changes over the fifteen years up to the gazetting of the land in 1960 from an approach intended to house the dispossessed around the existing township to one that desired their dispersal throughout the area. This change was the direct result of the "pepper potting" assimilationist methods of the period. There was also a shift from a belief that the dispossessed themselves should benefit to the view that Maori generally in the area should benefit. This also can be explained in part by a reluctance to concentrate Maori around the township; there would have been more pressure to do so if the benefits had gone directly to the land owners.

If the question of the taking of the Maori land around Takapuwahia Township is considered in the light of the 1943 intentions and the 1946 agreement then it can be seen that the process and agreements were very similar in intent to those for Orakei and Waiwhetu - to compensate dispossessed Maori occupying traditional settlements with specific housing improvements. The reason the Porirua situation was not to have the same results is because of the period over which it developed and the changing attitudes to concentration of Maori, to the notion that Maori living traditionally would assimilate into a general urban Maori population and the slow opening up of general housing resources to Maori.

Why did it take so long for the total area to be gazetted and why was it never finally developed for housing? The answers to these questions lie in the general development of housing policy over the period and also in the nature of the land. The Porirua scheme was notable for the massive earthworks that took place in the area and the reshaping of the hillsides. Nonetheless, the Housing Division chose to develop the easier flatter land first. The land behind the pa was relatively steep and more difficult to develop. For that reason it was deferred until the latter part of the development.

At the same time the frantic pace that had been characteristic of the schemes under the Labour government eased during the later 1940s as it confronted the need to acquire new land, and during the 1950s as the government struggled with promoting a viable private sector. The scheme had also to make the shift from a situation where land development and building was supervised by the state (the mainly state housing suburbs of the 1930s and 1940s) to a situation where the state was the land developer and the private sector built the houses.

In addition, during the early and mid 1950s the government injected increasing amounts of money into housing but it was the second Labour government that was to spend massive amounts on lending. This gave an impetus to the final land acquisition push in Porirua but by the time it had been acquired the government was already disinvesting in housing. It began

to concentrate on lending on existing houses, to withdraw total funds and increase densities. With this scenario the land was simply not needed and was peripheral to the new policies direction during the 1960s and 1970s. All these factors contributed to the slow pace of the acquisition process.

Finally, whether Takapuwahia C2A3 can be considered in the light of these early agreements remains to be decided. Undoubtedly, the government always intended to develop the whole area under the state housing scheme. It appears to have been the assumption throughout by land owners that this early agreed scheme applied to the whole area. Whether the original housing proposal was developed as a response to the taking of the land or whether the Housing Division and Maori Affairs Department saw an opportunity to piggy-back improvements on the back of the wider development is not totally clear. However, any decision on this issue must be considered in the light of events at Orakei and Waiwhetu over the same period, and in the fact that the Housing Construction Division only took a close interest in schemes under the Native Housing Act when it coincided with its need to acquire land. The idea to develop the land for state housing came from the Housing Branch, later the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works. The initial idea to develop a portion of the site for a Maori housing scheme appears to have been a joint response to the land acquisition issue.