

45. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] That falls on the purchaser?—Yes. This land stood me in 7s. 6d. an acre.

46. *The Chairman.*] You pray that the House shall afford you relief. What is the nature of the relief you would suggest?—To have the caveats removed off the land, so that I could register these deeds, and complete the sale.

47. Would there be any contingent claim?—I presume that if the caveats were removed by the Government, they would not withhold the Crown grants. In these blocks you never know when you will get the Crown grants. In the case of Ngatawakawaka, Puremungaahua, Matatuotonga, I would be perfectly willing to refund any sums of money which the Government may have paid to the grantees in that block.

48. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] Have you any idea what they have paid?—It is not much; perhaps £150. It is all very rough country there.

49. What did the Government agree to pay per acre?—2s; the same as myself. I did not know there was a caveat lodged against No. 3 till yesterday. I want to amend my petition to that extent. This block of land the Government never paid a sixpence on, or interfered with at all. I have accidentally omitted to put in No. 3 in my petition.

50. *The Chairman.*] We cannot alter this petition, but your statement will be taken down by the short-hand writer.

51. *Mr. Taiaroa.*] Have you paid the duty to the Government on all these blocks?—Yes; on all of them.

52. And they accepted it?—Yes; the Government accepted.

53. Was it the same Government accepted the duty and lodged the caveat?—Yes.

54. *Mr. Hobbs.*] What was the amount of duty?—£280 odd in one block, and £50 odd in another—ten per cent. on the purchase money.

55. *Mr. Taiaroa.*] Did any other Natives who were aggrieved at the time request the Government to lodge the caveat against your purchase?—No.

56. It was not done by the Natives?—No.

57. *Mr. Hamlin.*] Are you sure that this proclamation about No. 2 was not included in the block known as Tauwhareparae?—When I came to look over the boundaries, I find that they take in a portion of it.

58. Was not that the name by which the block was known?—No. It went through the Court as Waingaromia No. 2. The Natives from whom Wilson purchased claimed to own land there. Last year, after about a week's trial, my Natives proved their claim, and the others got defeated.

59. Who was the Judge presiding?—Judge Rogan. Mr. Wilson was in the Court, too, looking after the interests of his section of Natives.

60. Are you aware that Wilson was not dispensed with as a Government officer at the date you refer to?—I don't think so.

FRIDAY, 27TH SEPTEMBER, 1878.

MR. GILL, being in attendance, was examined.

61. *The Chairman.*] Will you please resume your evidence from that point at which you left off yesterday?—I now put in a copy of the Gazette containing the notification of intention to purchase the lands Tauwhareparae and Parariki (including Waingaromia No. 2), have examined Gazette, No. 26, March 4, 1876, for public purposes. The Court's order for the Block Waingaromia No. 2 is dated the 19th February, 1877, I also hand in the applications received for rehearing this block. The first from Henare Potai and others, received in September, 1876, was referred to the Chief Judge, and returned to Native office in January, 1877. It was again referred in February, and returned in August. These dates have some bearing on the present petition. There is also a second application for a re-hearing, dated the 10th of March, referred to the Chief Judge in April.

62. *The Chairman.*] The point, as I understand it, is not when these applications were returned by the Judge, but the period when they were made by the applicants?—True; but I would draw attention to the date when these applications were returned by the Chief Judge being after the Judge of the Court had given an order that the freehold tenure of the land should vest in Mr. Cooper.

63. Provision is made in the Native Land Court Act for claimants applying for a re-hearing, but is there any provision made for the withdrawal of applications?—No, not for the withdrawal of applications for a re-hearing. The Government either approves or disapproves.

64. An application for a re-hearing is a valid document in law, but an application for a withdrawal is not a valid document?—It is not contemplated by the Act. I have other applications for the re-hearing of this block, one from Henare Ruru, dated the 24th June, 1877, also an application from Henare Ruru to the Chief Judge dated July, 1877.

65. I see the Chief Judge has refused a re-hearing, apparently acting on the advice of Judge Rogan?—Yes.

66. *Mr. Rolleston.*] Is that subsequent to the request for a withdrawal?—Yes; the request to withdraw the application is dated 25th May. Judge Rogan's minute, read yesterday, is dated 12th July. There is another application for a re-hearing from Henare Ruru, dated 23rd July, 1877; also, an application from Retene Kuhukuhu and others, dated 12th June, 1877.

67. *The Chairman.*] Does the Chief Judge uniformly refuse to recommend a re-hearing in each of these cases?—Yes. This is a letter from Henare Potai to the Government, dated 3rd May, 1877, withdrawing the application. A similar letter, dated 25th May, 1877, appears to have been sent to Judge Rogan himself. (Letter put in.)

68. This letter you have just put in, asking that his application may be cancelled, may be taken for what it is worth?—The Government have not decided the question of a re-hearing or otherwise. I would call the attention of the Committee to the 50th section of "The Native Lands Act, 1873," in which the decision of the Court must be published in the Government Gazette. This block, known as Waingaromia No. 2, was gazetted on the 16th of April, in terms of the section of the Act referred to, with the names of the intended grantees.