182. 6th July, 1892, Manahi Paewai, £100?—Yes.

183. 15th September, 1892, Ihaia te Ngarara, £700?—Yes. 184. 28th November, 1891, Bank of New Zealand, £500?—Yes.

185. 20th April, 1891, Bank of New Zealand, £200?—Yes.

186. 23rd January, 1891, stamp duty, £44 12s. 9d.?—Yes. Tamaki Timber Company. 187. 4th March, 1891, stamp duty, £44 12s. 9d.?—Yes. Tamaki Timber Company. 188. 27th October, 1891, £116 10s. 3d., Native stamp duty?—Yes. 189. 23rd December, 1892, land-tax, £20 12s. 9d.?—Yes.

190. Can you state whether the cheques are all in the same writing, and whether both partners operated ?—Cannot say. My belief is Smith has, principally or wholly, on the Cadman and Smith account. The account is still open. Any cheque signed by Cadman would be honoured as well as any by Smith, within the limits of the overdraft.

191. Are you aware whether Cadman and Smith received payment from Mr. Knight?—I cannot say. Tamaki Timber Company have.

192. Do you produce cheque July 17, 1891, to Duncan Guy, £600?—Yes.

193. November 17, 1881, Deputy Assignee, £85?—Yes.

- 194. Cross-examined by Mr. Sainsbury. I believe all are signed by Smith that I have handed All Cadman and Smith's cheques are wholly in the handwriting of Mr. Smith.
  - 195. Benjamin Leonard Knight, examined by Mr. Rees. Am a sawmill proprietor.

196. You are the present holder of the lease of the Umutaoroa?—Yes.

197. How long have you been in possession?—Since 1886, about June.

198. Under the lease you have to pay royalties?—Yes.
199. Can you say what you paid in 1886?—Yes; £72 3s. 9d., to June, 1887; £318 15s. 11d., to December, 1887; £239 15s. 10d., to June, 1888; £483 12s. 9d., to September, 1888; £371 0s. 9d. to December, 1888; £445 16s. 1d. to June 30, 1889; £342 10s. 1d. to December 30, 1889; £812.7s. 1d., to March, 1890; £120 0s. 6d. to March 31, 1890; £54 12s. 8d., due that date, and paid; £277 1s. 10d., to September 30, 1890. Since that date I have not got the book. I think there has been, to end of last year, about £500. I have paid up to September, 1890, £4,302 10s. 5d. Since then royalties a great deal less. Since September, 1890, it has been about £500 a year.

200. Can you form an idea of the value of the timber to be cut?—I cannot. There is a small patch of totara; you cannot tell how that will turn out. Original lease to me was Cadman, Smith,

The last, so far as I know, has now no interest in it.

- 201. Did Cadman and Smith apply to you as to sale of any part?—They asked me to release a portion. I refused till two or three months ago. The communication was verbal—with Mr Smith. All communications were with Mr Smith.
- 202. Who has paid property-tax on the value of your lease?—I do not know. I have not. 203. Could you give any idea how many years cutting for one mill or two mills?—Three years for one mill for ordinary timber, and one year for totara. I should think six months cutting totara alone.
- 204. Cross-examined by Mr Sainsbury]. Besides the timber, a lot of plant was leased to me, that was their property. There was a very valuable plant. I know what a mile of tramway cost me—£1,120 during the last twelve months. I have only the use of the plant. I do not know what the value would be at the end—very doubtful. I should like to get a quarter of what my own cost.
- 205. Captain William Russell, examined by Mr Rees.] Am member for Hawkes Bay; have been so during present Parliament.

206. Are you aware of necessity for remedying Native land laws of the colony?—I have no

doubt there are many evils that want remedying.

207. Were you member of the Joint Committee to which Mr. Cadman's Bill was referred?—I think not. I was member of Committee set up to report on some Bill—that not a Joint Committee.

208. Do you remember Mr Ballance's suggestion, September 9th, 1891, [Hansard, Volume lxxiv., cited pp. 431, 429, and 429], that Mr. Rees should move the setting up of a small Committee of four or five members to draw Bill?—I remember there was a Committee. The Committee met and brought down a Bill. It did not become law.

209. Can you tell that efforts were made to?-I believe you were endeavouring in session 1891 to get provisions passed to give to Native committees the control and management of Native

lands.

210. Were you aware that you were endeavouring to get exclusion of Native Equitable Owners Act?—I do not recollect that. The Premier's object in setting-up the Committee I have

referred to was to meet some of the difficulties in past transactions.

211. Can you say whether in 1891 you were aided or opposed by Mr. Cadman?—I should say the general feeling of the Government was that Native matters ought to be left in their hands and not taken off the Government's hands. The tone was that Government were going to paddle their own canoe.

212. Do you remember the Tahoraiti Bill?—Yes, that there was a Bill. I have no doubt that in interest of races alterations should be made in Native land laws.

213. Cross-examined by Sir R. Stout.] It is difficult to agree on the alterations. not in favour of vesting the control in Native committees. I do not think the House had formed an opinion on that. I do not think it likely that such a Bill would pass. It is my belief, that I voted that the Tahoraiti Bill should be a public Bill. I attended the meetings of the Committee, and the Bill was brought up. It was brought in by Mr. Cadman. Clause 4 deals with past transactions.

214. Should you be surprised to hear that you opposed clause 4, and that Rees and Cadman

supported it?—There is no doubt that is so.

215. Are you aware that Government passed a Native Lands Validation Bill?—Yes; but law has been tinkered, not a remedy attempted. I do not think Committees would be carried.

2—田. 14.