NEW ZEALAND COMPANY REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE Correspondence from William Fox to Col. W Wakefield

Appendix V9 (Weblink SP Appendix V9)

Archives New Zealand Wellington Office New Zealand Reference Agency NZC (New Zealand Company) Series 3 Item 14 22-33

> Nelson 12th February 1844 William FOX Esq. Resident Agent No 11 Duplicate Forwarded by the "Sisters" via Hobart Town March 26th 1844 2 Enclosure - Relative to Mr Beit Report

To Col. W Wakefield Principal Agent NZ Coy. Wellington

Nelson New Zealand 27th January 1844

I beg to enclose a communication addressed through yourself to the Secretary of the New Zealand Company by Mr John N Beit, Immigration Agent for the Natives of Germany in this Settlement.

My previous Despatch have already touched upon several of the points to which it relates, it is so necessary however to advert to the others, and for facility of reference I have taken the liberty of numbering the paragraphs of Mr Beits report, to which my observations will apply,

1. With reference to the charge made by Mr Beit for what are termed Supplementary provisions, the facts are as follows. When the Principle Agent visited Nelson in July last, a complaint was made to him by the Emigrants per, "St Pauli", that they had not received during the voyage their allowance of provisions according to the New Zealand Company Dietary. The Principal Agent directed Mr Tuckett, then acting as Resident Agent, to investigate the matter and it was by him referred Dr McShane the English Immigration Agent, subject to the amperage of Mr White the Police Magistrate. Mr Tuckett limited the Enquiry to the difference between the Company Dietary and the amount alleged by Mr Beit to have been served out, and on this enquiry a considerable quantity of back rations was awarded to be due to the Emigrants which Mr Beit refunded in pursuance of the award. The sum of an £43.14.7 now claimed is the amount of these in back rations. The Germans allege that a much larger quantity is due to them, but the enquiry having been limited by Mr Tuckett as above mentioned, their claim was only partially investigated, and thought I have several times been urged to re-open the investigation I have though it prudent to decline, having no power to enforce Mr Beit compliance. So far as I have been able to ascertain, I believe that the Emigrants have never received what they were entitled to.

I enclose the Statement of Dr McShane showing the amounts deficient according to Mr Beits own admission also a letter from Mr Beit to Dr McShane acknowledging the fairness of the award. I am at a loss to understand on what grounds he now asks for compensation.

2 On the subject of the Hospital expenses I have already addressed you under date of 21st November 1843.

The following explanation may be added. During the voyage Mr Beit imposed fines upon several of the Emigrants for trifling acts of misconduct. On paying over their deposits after arrival in Nelson he deducted the amount of their fines, on which the Emigrants summoned him before the Police Magistrate, who inclining to adjudicate

in favour of the Emigrants adjourned in order to enable the parties to settle the matter out of Court. Mr Beit then applied to me to re-pay the fines, and to induce me to do so adverted to the hospital expenses which he contended ought to have been paid by the Company and urged that the one might be set against the other. I declined interfering but eventually on Mr Beit very urgent request that I would prevent the matter being brought again into Court. I consented to receive the amount from him and pay it over to the Germans, which I did having expressly repudiated the idea of the Company being at all implicated.

On the following day I was surprised at receiving a communication from Mr Beit to the effect that as I had directed the repayment of the fines, he should expect the Company to pay the hospital expenses, and on my refusing again to do so he informed me that he should refer the matter home as mentioned in my previous despatch. After what had passed between Mr Beit and myself in conversation, I could regard his conduct as nothing less than an attempt at imposition, which I told him at the time.

- 3. The allegation that the German expedition was met on its arrival with an entire want of attention and assistance is I believe entirely untrue. On the day of the arrival of the "St Pauli" Mr Beit and his very numerous family were taken into the house of Mr Jolloe, Dr McShane, Rev. Mr Reay and Dr Wilson and hospitably entertained some of then for five or six weeks till they could find accommodation elsewhere, and I am assured that more then usual attention was paid to the whole party. The Steerage passengers received the aid usually afforded to Immigrants, and I believe a very general interest existed on their favour.
- 4. On the subject of exchange of Mr Beit's sections I shall address you in a separate despatch. His statement relating to the subject is correct. As regards the remittance of the purchase money for the Unsold section, if I am required to express any opinion as to the grounds on which it is requested, I am bound to say that Mr Beit has not since his arrival in New Zealand acted in such a manner in his capacity of Immigration Agent as to entitle him to any remuneration at the hands of the Company.
- 5. The manner in which a few of the Colonial Sections have been dealt with will be the subject of a separate despatch. What has been done with regard to them has been with the object of carrying out your instructions to myself, that every facility and encouragement consistent with the vigorous execution of the Public Works should be afforded to the occupation of land by agricultural workman. The high prices put upon land by private owners, and the almost entire absence at this period of Agents empowered to deal with the property of absentees, obliged me to have recourse to a method of disposing of some of three sections, devised by the late Agent, though not in accordance with the original intentions of the Court of Directors in reference to them
- 6. To the subject of the lavish expenditure of the Public works I have frequently adverted in previous Despatches. By objects entirely foreign to the stipulations of the agreement of 15th February 1841, I conceive to be intended the Fortifications erected on the occasion of the late alarm, about half of which was effected under the agency of Mr Tuckett whose "just and loyal conduct" Mr Beit has taken occasion to land, and was one of the first acts by which he may be supposed to have relieved the uneasiness and apprehensions of the Settlers in the manner alluded to in Mr Beit Report. I have already addressed you very fully upon the subject of the completion by myself of the works commenced by Mr Tuckett under date of 6th of October 1843.
- 7. On the state of labour market I have also addressed you, under date of 1st November 1843. I may add that in consequence of complaints made by some of the land owners of the difficulty of obtaining labour recently discharged about 50 of the Best men and boys from the Public works. A deputation from the body visited the agricultural districts to seek employment, which four only succeeded in obtaining, and that for a short time. I questioned several on their return and was invariably informed that Mr Beit was one who had been applied to and who had refused to employ them. The consequences

of the intention I have shown to reduce the number of men employed by the Company is that above Forty men women and children have taken passage for Palpauaiso per "Christiana" which sails in a few days. In conversation with two of the principal farmers I yesterday computed the number of men employed by the agriculturists and they do not exceed fifty. The riotous temper which existed among them at the time of my arrival is in a great degree exorcised, but the result of any further reduction of employment by the Company will certainly be a considerable re emigration.

- 8. On the subject of Mr Beit obligation to maintain or employ the German Emigrants I have also addressed you under date of 7th November 1843. I made an effort to avail myself of that Gentleman's services in his capacity of Immigration Agent, but found that it was attended with much more inconvenience than the entire absence of such an office would have been
- 9. In requiring a deed of exchange from Mr Beit I acted under the advise of the Company's solicitor in this Settlement, whose opinion on the subject was in accordance with my own. I believe the expense of such a document would not exceed five guineas, the consolidation of sections obtained by it is an object of considerable value, the balance of purchase money on the transaction being £225.
- 10. The Subject of the destruction of the timber was refereed to me by Mr Beit, who alleged that it had been used by the Company in erecting the Immigration Depot. On reference to Mr Tuckett he informed me that there was never any valuable timber on Mr Beits Section, but only some firewood and fencing no part of which was taken by the Company. I am unwilling to admit the obligation of the Company to maintain Unsold sections in precisely the condition in which they were when the Town plan was designed, and Mr Beits' conduct with regard to Section 29 presently adverted to, is in direct opposition to any such view.

Finding on Mr Beits' application that Col. Wakefields' instructions to the Company's' solicitor to remove the squatters had not been carried into effect, I conferred with the latter gentleman and was informed that the only method of getting rid of them was by action of ejectment, which in the present state of the titles could not be maintained. The parties being determined to resist. When Mr Beit applied to me on the subject he informed me that it was not his intention immediately to occupy the section in question, nor is it likely from its proximity to the nearest part of the Town ("Little Scotland") that he ever really intended to erect his own house upon it.

11 On my opposition to the erection of a wharf by Mr Beit, I have already addressed you under date of 11th December 1843, Subsequently to my protest against his occupation of the water frontage, he proceeded without even as King permission to excavate Section 29. For the purpose of filling in his wharf, and had carried away some hundred tons of soil before I was aware of it. I appealed to the Magistrates summoning his head workman as the party most amenable to conviction, my application was successful, and the man would have been committed for trial but that I consented not to press the matter on Mr Beits' undertaking to abandon the excavation. Whether the excavation and usurpation of the frontage of the Section be really beneficial as alleged by Mr Beit, must be a matter of taste with the future proprietor.

On the **arrival of the "Pymalaya"** Mr Martin one of the passengers conceiving his Section to be "29" in the Town plain instead of "29 Order of choice" asked me where it lay, and on my pointing out that on which Mr Beit was intruding, he demanded compensation from the Company, stating that he considered its value entirely destroyed by Mr Beits' operations and opinion in which I certainly concur.

That it was my declared object to put Mr Beit to expense, by the steps I took in this matter, is not true.

The remaining points of Mr Beits' Report do not require any comment from me.

I cannot however conclude without adverting to the course pursued by Mr Beit since his connection with the Expedition of German Emigrants. His conduct as superintendent

during the voyage out was succession of acts of petty tyranny, according to the report of the missionaries and other parties of respectability whose conduct in the Settlement has afforded a sufficient guarantee for the correctness of what they state; and the statement is corroborated by the exacerbated state of feeling which existed towards Mr Beit in the minds of the Emigrants at the time of arrival. Immediately on landing acts of a most arbitrary nature brought him under the reprimand of the Police Magistrate, which has subsequently been repeated, and recently the local Judge in open Court convicted him of deliberate falsehood (see Nelson Examiner January 20th 1844), he has unnecessarily contrived to get into hot water with every body with whom, he has come in contact, the Clergyman, the Banker, and nearly every respectable person have refused to have any intercourse with him; Dr Imlays' cattle Agency which had been placed in his hands has been withdrawn under circumstances very discreditable to him, and I consider it my duty to state any connection between the New Zealand Company and Mr Beit, is not likely to contribute to the interests of the Settlement.

I am Sir Your Obedient Servant William Fox

Agency NZC Series 3 Item 14 Nelson 05th August 1843

Statement showing the total amount of Ordinary Rations to which the Emigrants per "St Pauli" were entitled during the voyage from Hamburg to Nelson, the Quantities issued for their use, according to the Superintendents' accounts, and the excess or deficiency where any occurs.

Items	Quantity required for the voyage	Amount issued by Supdt. Acct.	Excess	Deficiency	Remarks	
	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	If fresh bread has been issued in due	
Biscuits	12,540	11,000		1,540	Proportion with fresh meat the amount	
Salt Beef	2,430	3,040	610		would have been 4,055 Bre. And	
Salt Pork	2,430	2,700	270		9,048¾ Bisc.	
Soup & Bouille	1,749	900		849	900 lbs. were thrown overboard being	
Fresh Meat	3,491	3,480		11	spoil.	
Flour	3,0771/2	3,600	5221/2		Fresh meat was issued daily for 7 weeks	
Raisins	862	900	38		during which no flour was served out	
Suet	320¾	318.6oz		2.6oz	except to children between 1 & 7 years	
Peas	1710	2,000	290		of age; others having the usual	
Rice Barley etc.	1,8221/2	2,300	4771/2		allowance of be.[sic] together with an	
Potatoes	9,785	5,000		4,785	additional quantity of Por. [sic]	
Sour Kraut	2,430	1,800		630	Further remarks Jany. 26 th 1844	
Plums	855	800		55	After balancing the excess of some	
Tea	741/4	80	53/4		articles the deficiency of others, &	
Coffee	2221/2	200		221/2	substitute Beef for Biscuit, flour for	
Chocolate	2963/4	250		46¾	Kraut & vinegar I recommended that.	
Sugar	1,7811/4	1,600		1811/4	the following articles should be issued	
Butter	1,1871/2	1,048		139½	and they were according served out by	
Salt		"	"	"	Mr J N Beit.	
Vinegar	1,1871/2	480		7071/2		

	lb.		lb. oz.
Beef	509	or	5.4
Flour	1315		13.13
Potatoes	2583		27.3
Plums	17		$0.2\frac{3}{4}$
Chocolate	463/4		.7 7/8
Sugar	1811/4		1.131/2
Butter	139½		1.7 2/3

Alex. MacShane Immigration Agent