

own pocket, and that the rest of my people would pay another £50, making £100. I did not think that it would cost more than £100. Mr. Poynton said he would go into any arrangement we came to, but he could not allow us to pay for it. He said the Department must pay for the survey—the very thing we wanted to avoid, because probably we would have to pay interest upon that survey money. I do not suppose the Public Trustee will lend out his money without interest. With respect to this 54 acres I have mentioned, it is a prime piece of land, and the Public Trust Office takes good care to keep their eye upon that particular piece of land. But who has put the value on that land? I have done so, and my son has done so, and yet they would take a portion of that value away from us and give it to others who have no right there at all. That is the position. If they see there is a good piece of land of great value they say you must give it up to the rest of the grantees. That is the way I am treated, although this land is really my own land. This sort of thing is of daily occurrence. One of my relatives went to see Mr. Carroll when he was in Taranaki, and laid before him the wishes of my relatives. He explained to him that they wished to subdivide; that they wanted to be allowed to subdivide their land. Mr. Carroll said it was his wish that they should subdivide their lands. Mr. Fisher did not wish the subdivision to take place, but Mr. Carroll said that it should be subdivided. What was the consequence? I got a telegram yesterday saying that Mr. Fisher and two of the owners had met secretly about this subdivision, in order probably that the rest of the owners might not know. This is the telegram I received yesterday: “Mrs. Brown, Wellington Hotel, Wellington.—Fisher had secret meeting with Rangī and Teiti re division Matarikōriko. Owners not notified. What does this mean?—TAITOKO.” What can be the meaning of this mystery—

16. The two persons mentioned in that telegram, are they owners?—They probably may be in the same grant. It is a 500-acre reserve. Then, again, I get a number of complaints from Natives in every direction I go, and requests that I should do something to relieve this irritation of the administration of the law. The powers are so great, they tell me, that in consequence a great number of them go away to Parihaka, and there they remain. They do not care to come back. They cannot occupy their lands. They think they have no right on the land, that they are simply *mokais*. They can do nothing whatsoever without the consent of the Public Trustee.

17. *Mr. Parata.*] Do you know of any other Natives who are complaining?—Any amount of them.

18. It is a general feeling?—Yes; it is a feeling growing daily. I will give you an instance. This letter was handed to me the day before I left. I have been asked on several occasions to interfere, but I have always said No. However, the day before I came away, a Mrs. Stockman came to me and asked me to place their case before the Government, because she said they had no money, and could not get any money without going to the Public Trustee. She said, “Cannot you give us a helping hand?” I told her that unless she had something tangible to show it would be of no use, but that if she had something tangible to show me I would take it with me. She then wrote me this letter: “28th July, 1904.—MRS. BROWN,—I hereby declare that the land in No. 5 Block, in the Waihi District, in the occupation of the children of the late Edward Stockman (whom they succeeded), for which they now have to pay (to the Trustee) 3s. an acre above the rent they should receive, but have not received for the last two years. Being trustee for my children, I authorise Mrs. Jane Brown to use their signatures to help to bring things to a more satisfactory state.—EMILY STOCKMAN, Trustee.—Names of children, Cyril Stockman, Daniel Stockman, Stella Rose (*née* Stockman).” That is the position of Mrs. Stockman and her family. Then, there is Mrs. Skelton and her family. I could name dozens in the same position as myself, and they are all practically Europeans. Their children can scarcely speak a word of Maori.

FRIDAY, 9TH SEPTEMBER, 1904.

HENI TE RAU (Mrs. BROWN) further examined. (No. 7.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You were proceeding to state your case yesterday when the Committee adjourned, Mrs. Brown. Have you anything further to state?—Yes; I think so.

2. Have you anything further to add to what you have already stated?—Just a little. Yesterday I forgot to add that it was in 1877 or 1878 I was put in possession of this particular piece of land. That was before the subdivision. The subdivision took place in 1887. My uncle, Pamariki, placed me on this land, and helped me to build my house on this particular piece of land, knowing that I was the rightful owner according to Maori custom in the ancestral right, and from that time till now I have held it in possession. For the twenty years, of course, as I related to the Committee yesterday, I have held possession of it, and yet I have been told that my tenant has to leave it. I would like to point out to the Committee, if they would allow me, or perhaps the Committee would ask Mr. Poynton, as I understood him to say that if Mrs. Thompson's share had been cut off her rent would have gone direct to her, less the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Why I wish to draw the Committee's attention to this is, that it is not at all consistent with the Public Trustee's action towards myself. My piece of land, as I have said—I have shown the orders here—cost me the sum of £40 for subdivision. Well, after twenty years, I have been told that it does not belong to me. Therefore, Mrs. Thompson's case was totally different; she was told that she was totally different, and her interest was not cut off. Had it been so, her rent would have been sent to her direct. That is why I wanted to point this out to the Committee, because it is not consistent with the Public Trustee's action in demanding rent from my tenant, and giving him notice that if he did not pay in so many days he would be ejected, and that the Department would take possession of the land. I would like the Committee also to ask Mr. Poynton why Mr. Fisher was not present, because there would have been many questions that I should have liked to have asked Mr. Fisher myself. Why he was not here, perhaps the Public Trustee would be able to answer. My hapu is really a family hapu. We belong to one common grandfather and grandmother, and we are very industrious. We are not known to go about and idle the time away like half of those that are