

Mackay's judgment should be set aside. His judgment was that we had no right by mana. I may state that we have large quantities of land, and this land was awarded to us by mana and by occupation. If this award made by Judge Mackay is allowed to stand, I suppose all the other claimants through mana will be thrown out in the same way as we have been. Therefore it is that we ask the Committee to allow our objections to this award.

6. *Mr. Carroll.*] Are these all the grounds on which you petition?—Yes.

7. *Mr. Graham.*] When that area of 2,500 acres was awarded, was it in a separate block by itself; was it cut off from the other portion of the same block; was it cut off a large piece, or itself separate?—It was not cut off; it was part of a larger piece.

8. *Mr. Parata.*] On what ground did the first Court make its award?—They said the mana we set up was a good claim, but then only 2,500 acres were awarded to us.

9. *Mr. Taipua.*] How did the second Court make its award?—We were grieved to find that the Court held we had no right by mana. We had not been satisfied in the first instance.

10. *Mr. Carroll.*] At the rehearing Judge Mackay disallowed the grounds of mana altogether?—Yes.

11. Was it in consequence of the rehearing that that took place?—That is what we suppose; others think it was in consequence of another application.

12. How many days did the hearing of the case last altogether?—I think it amounted to two months altogether; at all events we were several weeks over it.

13. *The Chairman.*] Do you mean the last hearing?—In both cases.

14. *Mr. Ormond.*] Was the evidence you gave on the second occasion the same as you gave in the first instance?—Yes; several of the people gave evidence on the first occasion, but, I think, they all did so on the second occasion.

15. *Mr. Parata.*] What claim did you put in?—We claimed the land as left to my people as a gift.

16. For what was it left?—As payment for food; besides, other people came and tried to conquer it in battle, but they were defeated; others again came, and they were served the same way.

17. Then, you are claiming in two ways, on account of the food you gave and conquering the land?—Yes.

18. How many hapus were admitted as claimants to that block in the first instance? What I want to know is, seeing that 2,500 acres were awarded to you, who got the remainder?—The name of the tribe is the Ngatikeri, but there were several sections of tribes in it.

19. Did Te Keri's people get the remainder of the block?—Yes.

20. Did you have that 2,500 acres awarded in the second instance?—No, we were not allowed any at all.

21. Who were the people that objected to you obtaining 2,500 acres?—I suppose they were the same as made objections in the first instance.

22. You now ask for a third hearing of that block?

*The Chairman.*] I would ask Mr. Lewis, the Under-Secretary of the Native Department, if he can tell us anything as to the position of this land?

*Mr. Lewis.*] I am only aware that the rehearing of the block was granted by the Chief Judge; that the rehearing has taken place; that the Chief Judge's functions are exhausted, and he has no further power in the matter. The only other recourse must be to legislation. I should state that the Native Department has nothing to do with this question at all.

23. *Mr. Ormond.*] I would ask the witness whether she knows if other claimants are dissatisfied with the judgment?—Yes.

24. Does she know Henry Matiu: does he object to it?—I have not heard that he has sent in any petition with reference to this block.

25. Would Matiu's objection be the same as yours?—I have heard that the objection he made was to the divisions in the block; my objection relates to the time when Mackay heard this case.

26. Henry Matiu is in Wellington?—Yes.

27. Have you heard that the right by mana has been set aside in any other judgment?—Yes, I have heard of cases, but we say that the right by mana is a good claim.

28. Did you ever hear of a case set aside on the ground that the claim was by mana?—No, I never heard of any case being set aside on account of the claim being by mana.

29. Did not the Native Land Courts formerly and up to lately take mana as one of the grounds of their judgment in favour of the applicant?—Yes; I have always heard they accepted it as a good claim.

30. *The Chairman.*] When the rehearing was granted was there any other application from other Natives for a rehearing?—Yes; all applied for a rehearing.

31. Was that in consequence of the small portion you got out of the block?—Yes.

32. *Mr. Taipua.*] How many blocks of land, do you know, have been awarded by the Court upon a claim through mana?—I cannot enumerate them, but a great number have been settled in that way.

33. *Mr. Ormond.*] Is it your experience that the Court always recognises mana as constituting a claim?—I never before heard of the Court objecting to people claiming by mana. I never knew it except in this last Court.

WEDNESDAY, 14TH DECEMBER, 1887.

MR. ALEXANDER MACKAY, Native Land Court Judge, examined.

34. *Mr. Hutchison.*] The petitioner yesterday seemed to wish the Committee to understand that you, in rehearing this claim, had ruled that mana could have no place in influencing your