

98. *Mr. Shrimski.*] If trustees were to be appointed to manage an estate of yours, and they acted in a similar manner to that in which you have acted in respect to this estate, would you think that they were doing right?—I think we have done our duty conscientiously. *Mr. G. Hunter, M.H.R.*

99. Would you allow your tenants to spend their rents without your permission?—*Mr. Williams* had full permission.

100. And did he spend it properly?—Yes. He always produced accounts and vouchers at the end of the year.

101. *Mr. Swanson.*] Do you consider this as a private or a public trust? Do you think it is exclusively for the benefit of the Church of England, or held in the interests of the public?—It is held by the trustees in terms of the grant, and the purposes of the trust are recited in the deed.

102. Here the Bishop says, "I am not aware that any private estate, such as Te Aute?"—The Bishop refers to a private estate, which might belong to you or anybody, but that does not apply to this estate. I think he is right in what he says.

103. Then there is a reply in his evidence as follows: "That is to me, as a trustee, a matter of utter indifference; I and the other trustees act conscientiously in endeavouring to do the best we can for the Trust, and we are utterly indifferent to outside opinion?"—Quite so.

104. You do not think public opinion ought to be considered at all. You think you should only consult your own inner consciousness with reference to anyone else's opinions?—I consider it is a matter in which the public have no right to interfere.

105. *Mr. Murray.*] In the event of the trustees mismanaging the estate, to whom would they be responsible?—That is a question I cannot answer.

106. To whom would you consider yourself responsible?—To the Supreme Court of the colony. Only very recently a case of the same kind came before the Supreme Court. I refer to the application by Wi Parata.

107. Who would proceed against you?—In the case I referred to, the Natives considered themselves aggrieved, and through their chief, made an application to the Supreme Court. The judgment of the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Richmond, was published in the papers.

108. Would that not make it appear that this is a public trust and not a private trust for the Church of England?—I do not regard this as a trust for the Church of England. I consider it is a private trust.

109. Do you think it would be better to let the estate by public auction than to let it privately. Would you not in that way get more for it?—There is an element in the consideration of the matter, which we, as trustees, cannot eliminate. That is, we consider it is for the advantage of the trust that Mr. Williams should continue in the position he has occupied so many years, and in which he has done so much good, and has given his services free of charge. That is an important element for us to consider as administrators of the trust.

110. He has looked after the school?—And the property also.

111. What would be the value of the services he has rendered to the trust?—You know what clergymen and teachers generally get. I am sorry to say they do not get well paid. £400 or £500 a year I should think.

112. *Mr. Seaton.*] Mr. Williams said he had received a little over £200 a year. So you consider the trust has been indebted to him for a considerable time to the amount of £300 a year?—Yes, quite that.

113. I think the Committee would like to know what claims there would have been against the trust funds, supposing Mr. Williams had not acted so generously as he had done. The Church Society it seems gives £200 a year?—That is an English Society. The money does not come from New Zealand. We should have to engage a schoolmaster, and we should certainly not get one under £200 or £300 a year. Besides, Mr. Williams has this advantage: he was born in New Zealand, and and is one of the best Maori scholars in the colony; and, moreover, he is thoroughly respected by the Natives.

114. *The Chairman.*] The question has been raised, as to whom in the event of the trust being mismanaged, the trustees would be responsible, and you said the Supreme Court. Now, as this trust has been instituted under the authority of law, if the legislature at any time thought the trustees were not carrying out their duty, could not the legislature take the property out of the hands of the trustees and vest in whom else it thought proper?—I presume Parliament could do anything.

115. Parliament has the power of dealing with the trust as well as the Supreme Court?—That is a matter of opinion.

116. Do you recognise that the Parliament which constituted the trust has power to alter or vary it?—That is entirely a legal question.

117. It is a question upon which you do not feel competent to give an opinion?—No; but I think the judgment given by the Supreme Court, the other day, bears directly upon the subject.

WEDNESDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER.

REV. S. WILLIAMS further examined.

*Rev. S. Williams.*] Before proceeding further, I hope the Committee will allow me to state that, when giving evidence yesterday, and when I was questioned as to putting the boys to work, I do not think it possible that any gentleman would suppose that I had been making use of the boys' services for my own profit; but it appears to me that Mr. Swanson had that idea, perhaps gathered from question and answer 45, in Colonel Whitmore's evidence before the Legislative Council Committee. I would like to state clearly that for many years I have given positive instructions that no schoolboy should be permitted to do any work on my premises, which are distinct from the school premises, or on the estate. Since it has been let, on one occasion three of the boys did volunteer to *Rev. S. Williams.*

14th Nov., 1877.