

if any?—The area in the allocation schedule appears to be 210,502 acres. My office has been issuing warrants for the titles of the company for the lands comprised in the schedule. In doing so, we have arrived at a stage when an estimate can be made of the exact, or nearly the exact, area available for the company under the contract. I estimate that the company will receive titles in the whole for 203,033 acres, which shows a deficiency on the estimated amount in the schedule of 7,468 acres 3 roods 19 perches. This is an approximate estimate, as, until the surveys have been carried further, we cannot state precisely the true amount.

161. Can you say whether the deficiency is likely to be diminished or increased?—I cannot anticipate which way it will be.

162. Is there any chance of it being materially diminished?—I hope this estimate will be found correct when the survey is complete. The deficiency arises through certain sections of land having been sold by the Commissioner of Crown Lands between the time of the preparation of the allocation map and the signing of the contract. The area so disposed of in Fitzherbert District and the Forest Reserve at the Gorge amounts to 1,208 acres; then, in surveying the boundary-line of the Forest Reserve from the Gorge southwards, the company's scheme showed the line differently from the sketch map, and this affects the area by 3,040 acres. Also in the Akatarawa District certain sections were included in the allocation—inadvertently, I presume, because they had been sold or set apart for other purposes. The permanent railway reserve on the Rimutaka of 4,450 acres was also included in the allocation area. The total of those areas which I have just specified amount to about 10,840 acres. On the other hand, additions have been made to the areas in other localities, which account for the difference between 10,840 and 7,469 acres.

163. May I ask whether any portion of the land so deficient was agricultural land?—The Fitzherbert sections would hardly be classed as agricultural land—it is pastoral land; we would offer it for £1 per acre. The 1,205 acres are worth about £1 per acre.

164. Will you state the values of the other deficient portions: in reality, what the value of the seven thousand odd acres would be?—I prefer to give it by sections. The Fitzherbert sections would be worth £1 per acre; the encroachment on the Forest Reserve, along the forest back boundary—3,040 acres—5s. an acre; the sections which have now been excluded from the allocation area in the Akatarawa District may be valued at 10s. per acre; and the permanent railway reserve on the Rimutaka I put at from 2s. 6d. to 5s. per acre.

165. I observe that you class the encroachment on the Forest Reserve at 5s. an acre. Are you aware of the valuation put upon the adjacent land?—I believe the company sold or tried to sell the land at about £1 per acre.

166. I ask whether the land of the same class which you now value at 5s. per acre was not valued for the purpose of the contract throughout at £1 per acre?—Yes; it has been so valued.

167. Why do you assume that this is only worth 5s. an acre, when the adjacent land was valued at £1?—My reason for putting the value at 5s. per acre is that it really includes the tops of hills—the country lying at the back of the Fitzherbert Block. You will understand that the frontage land may be worth £1 10s., and the back land 2s. 6d.

168. Why do you differentiate the deficient area from the rest of this, which appears to be all of the same character?—Well, as I have tried to explain to the Committee, the area that I am valuing is a narrow strip along and takes in the higher tops of the hills. When I made the valuation I valued the back land at 2s. 6d., and the frontage land at whatever it might be worth.

169. Can you say when the block called Tuwhakatupua was bought?—I cannot.

170. *Mr. Ross.*] Do you consider £1 per acre a fair average valuation for the land?—I think it was.

Major KEMP examined.

171. *Mr. Travers.*] Do you know the blocks of land called Horowhenua and Tuwhakatupua?—I know Horowhenua, not Tuwhakatupua.

172. Have you any interest in the Horowhenua Block?—Yes.

173. Has that block been passed through the Native Land Court?—Yes.

174. To whom has it been allocated by the Court?—It was awarded to me, and I allocated portions of it to other people when it was subdivided. Are you asking about the whole of the block?

175. I am asking about the whole of the Horowhenua Block. Have you any authority from the other persons interested in the block to sell it or dispose of it?—Why ask me when I am the chief owner of that block?

176. It is not to offend, but merely to have an answer?—The land is mine, and is divided amongst my people.

177. Are you now in a position, and when were you in a position, to sell it according to the law of Parliament?—I have no wish to sell the land; I have power to sell.

178. When did the land pass through the Court so as to give you power to sell?—In 1886.

179. Did you offer to sell that land to the Government, or any part of it?—I sold portions of it to my friend, Mr. Ballance, about the time of the last sitting of Parliament.

180. When did you first offer any part of it for sale to the Government?—This was a confirmation on my part of the previous arrangement. I wished to establish a township there, but thought I should not be able to do so; and so I sold portion of the land to the Government.

181. Did you not offer to sell the whole of the block to the Government?—Which block do you mean? I am not going to prevaricate or beat about the bush. I agreed to sell 4,000 acres; that is all I would sell.

182. That was in 1886?—No; in 1887—this year. I have nothing further to say.

183. I want to ask you at what date was the transaction settled when you conveyed the land to the Government?—It was this year, during last session.

184. When the money was paid?—Yes. The money was paid to me, and I gave over the and, and there was an end to it.