

52. That would be exclusive of the sheep. What are they worth?—I should not like to give an off-hand answer to that question. They are ordinary cross-bred sheep. *Rev. S. Williams.*

53. *Mr. Seaton.*] Is this land fit for arable purposes?—I think Mr. Johnston's statement is correct. A little of it may be fit for agricultural purposes, but a very little. *13th Nov., 1877.*

54. *Mr. Sutton*] If the block was cut up it would still not be of much use except for pastoral purposes?—The great bulk would not.

55. The land, excepting that near the school, is not first-class land?—No; speaking generally, I should like to see some of the gentlemen, who deem it arable land, attempt to cultivate it.

56. *Mr. Swanson.*] Some of the natives complain that their children were not taken in?—I have done my best to induce them to come.

57. Is it true that the children were compelled to work on the farm?—I do not think any native has stated it so.

58. That is not the question. The question is, Is the statement true?—No; the children had not to work, except for their own benefit.

59. Were they paid for their work?—No; they many years since cultivated potatoes, to be used by themselves, and work of that kind was made a strong point of by Bishop Selwyn and Sir George Grey, that the children should be expected to do a certain amount of work for their own benefit.

60. Is there any truth in this statement: that the reason the children did not go to the school was that those who were there, were ill fed, ill clothed, and improperly treated?—I never heard of such a complaint till I came here. It is not true.

61. Was not Renata one of the original owners of this land. He says in his evidence that he was one of the chiefs who gave his consent to the endowment?—Neither Renata, Karaitiana, Henare Tomoana, nor Henare Matua had any interest in the Te Aute school estate. It is, however, fair to state that Karaitiana, Puhare, Tareha, Moananui, and other chiefs offered me a block of the Ahuriri Plains, including what is now known as West Clive, and part of the Big Bush, on condition that I would go and live upon it. Te Aute was considered more central for my missionary work, which extended as far south as Castle Point, and into the Seventy-Mile Bush, and for this reason principally the Ngaitiwhatuipiti offer at Te Aute was accepted, and the Ngati Kahuhunu offer fell through, and that land was not reserved.

62. Were the two Hawke's Bay men, examined by Mr. Locke, the only men present, that they should be the only witnesses examined?—No. Others were to have been examined, but the explanation given me was that there was no interpreter to go with Mr. Locke, but that these two men came in his way, and he took their evidence. He would have taken more evidence, but was informed that the enquiry had closed.

63. Of what use would an interpreter be to Mr. Locke?—I should not think he was necessary. But I am not responsible for the instructions given, or for the reason given why more persons should not have been examined.

64. Who instructed Mr. Locke?—The Chairman of the Committee, through the Native Office.

64a. Could you give the committee a list of the other men you would like to have been examined?—Yes. I can recollect four names. They are as follows:—Tamati Te Maruhaere, Paora Nikahere, Paora Temaihotua, Peni Te Namairangi. I could have named others had it been considered advisable.

WEDNESDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1877.

MR. G. HUNTER, M.H.R., examined.

65. *The Chairman.*] The Committee wish to get from you, as one of the Trustees of the Te Aute estate, some information regarding the estate. You are one of the trustees, I believe?—Yes. *Mr. G. Hunter, M.H.R.*

66. The property at the present time appears to be let to the Rev. Samuel Williams?—It is.

67. But his lease expires in February next?—Yes. *14th Nov., 1877.*

68. We have here four petitions, but all are of the same character, and suggest that the estate should be cut up into smaller properties when the present lease expires and put up to auction. Can you state what are the intentions of the trustees in regard to the land?—That is a question I decline to answer.

69. The matter has not been fully decided by you yet?—No.

70. Which do you think, from your knowledge of the estate, would be the most beneficial course to pursue at the expiration of the present lease, to let it in one or many blocks?—I do not think it is a property which could be advantageously cut up into many blocks,

71. Supposing it were private property instead of being property on trust for certain public purposes, do you think it would be more advantageous to deal with it in one block or to divide it into two or more blocks?—Do you mean advantageous in the way of realising income?

72. Yes, and for the benefit of the estate?—The trustees have always recognised that they have greatly benefited the estate and trust, by having secured Mr. Williams to take charge of it, which he has done without any charge whatever.

73. I am speaking of the future. Here is a certain estate which has been rented by Mr. Williams for a certain period. The lease expires in February next, and the question is, whether for the future it would be desirable to divide the block or to continue to let it in one block?—I believe for the benefit of the trust, if a satisfactory arrangement could be made with Mr. Williams, it would be much better to leave the property in his hands. I am not in any way interested, personally, but as a trustee am anxious to do my best for all interested. I think it would be well to leave the management in his hands if a satisfactory arrangement could be come to.

74. That is with the idea of getting as many children educated as possible at as early a date as possible?—Clearly. That has been our object all along. Of course we have taken into consideration Mr. Williams's services.

2.—I. 2c.