Mr. Levi: If the above was Mr. Livingston's view, I say that his duty was not to make a compromise. It shows, at any rate, that he had mistaken his position. It was an important thing to the Natives, on whose behalf he was acting, as it took away from them the greater part of their rents for periods of from one to four years.

Mr. Stewart: I cannot help thinking that the arbitrators had a very extravagant notion of their own importance, so far as the evidence shows it.

Mr. Levi: On that point the evidence speaks for itself. A return has been put in by my learned friend, which, however, he has not referred to in any way, but I presume he put it in to be in some way a guide to the Committee. It is a return of the property-tax valuations for the last three periods—1882, 1885, and 1888. I have gone to some trouble to obtain the names of the different valuers of these properties. Mr. Mackay has obtained them for me from the Property-tax Office. Now, sir, I have taken my friend's return—I have taken all the assessments for 1885 and 1888, and put them under the heads of the different valuers who made these valuations. I will put in the result which I have obtained:—

No. 1, Whareroa, Mokoia, and Part Taumaha.

No. of Lease.	1885. G. V. Bate.	1888. John Heslop.
	£	£
2	1,161	1,136
3	4,500	4,477
4	4,070	3,344
5	2,152	1,567
10	2,457	2,272
11	2,960	2,972
13	1,300	1,140
14	13,000	10,909
15	1,140	1,287
22	3,570	2,000
23	1,382	779
24	1,802	1,206
25	102	170
26	3,388	3,022

No. 1, Whareroa, Mokoia, and Part Taumaha.

No. of Lease.	1885. G. V. Bate.	1888. John Heslop.
	£	£
27	1,000	649
28	408	560
30	1,250	4,750
31	4,500	
32	2,136	1,725
49	3,321	1,650
50	1,300	1,200
51	800	750
52	240	270
53	235	156
55	3,000	2,125
	61,174	50,107

No. 2 and 3, Part Taumaha and to Whenuakura.

No. of Lease.	1885. J. Hurley.	1888. E. C. & F. T. Horner.
	£	£
8	600	400
36	1,500	1,466
40	6,150	4,750
41, 42	4,265	3,380
43	525	450
44	800	800
46	2,084	1,850
	15,924	13,096

No. 4, Whenuakura to Waitotara.

No. of Lease.	1885. H. F. Mason.	1888. Fookes & Thurston.
	£	£
7	355	403
12	700	854
16	1,798	1,903
17	1,539	1,924
18	813	1,219
19	810	1,215
20	2,022	2,023
21	316	422
38	2,000	2,500
39	2,192	2,754
45	3,872	3,837
47	80	532
	16,477	19,586

I dwell on this in order to show how unreliable that return is. Taking one division of the leases, valued by Mr. Bate in 1885 and Mr. Heslop in 1888, I find that the total valuations of 1885 are reduced in 1888 from £61,174 to £50,107. In nearly every case a large reduction was made. In the second class of leases, valued by Mr. Hurley in 1885 and Messrs. Horner in 1888, the total valuations for 1885 are reduced in 1888 from £15,924 to £13,096; but in the third division, valued by Mr. Mason in 1885 and by Messrs. Fookes and Thurston in 1888, the totals of 1885 are increased in 1888 from £16,477 to £19,586. Almost in every case in the last division the valuers for 1888 have largely increased the valuations. This shows, at least, the very different views that different persons take as to whether values have increased or decreased. In almost every case in one district the valuation is increased; in every case in another it has decreased.

Then, to sum up, what we ask is this: that the awards of the arbitrators be set aside, and that no renewals or substitutions be granted without the consent of the Natives interested. That is the main thing we ask. But I am, at the same time, bound to point out that, although I think we have made out a just claim to that relief, if honourable members are not convinced by my argument—if they do not consider that we are entitled to full relief—there are several degrees of less relief which, although falling far short of the relief to which I claim we are entitled, they can give us. For instance, if they consider that some renewals or new leases should be granted in the first place they can determine that the rents of the new leases shall be assessed upon the improved instead of the unimproved values.

Mr. Stewart: That would lead to another arbitration.

Mr. Levi: Not necessarily, for we have the full valuations made by the arbitrators, and there are also the Property-tax returns. If the Committee do not consider we are entitled even to that