

through this hapu-name. Rata married Pakiorehua, and their children were Rupekatau and Toukararai. Toukararai married Hukatere and begot Tuperiri, and Rupekatau begot Tohunga, and Tohunga begot Whakairinga and Paretaua; Titoki begot Eruene Pairimu, and Paretaua married Paewhenua, second child of Tuperiri, and Paretaua also married Whakaoriki and begot Uruamo. This is the ancestor from whom we descend to-day. Under him the land was originally awarded at the first hearing, and we claimed that Toukararai was the ancestor through whom the right to the land has descended. Tuperiri's right was obtained through conquest, because he came through that Ngati-Whatua and to fight against the tribe of Ngaiwai, who were the original owners of the land. That is why we claim the original right to the land, and so do the old people before us. Toukararai was the original owner of the land. This will be found in the minute-book containing the Court's judgment. Now I will go back to Rupekatau, the elder brother of Toukararai. Eruene Pairimu was one of the first to get the Crown grant, so after the descending of the ancestor to him the award was granted: he was a descendant from Rupekatau, the elder child. I want to explain to the Committee here—I want to give the descent from Rupekatau in order to satisfy the Committee that we, the present petitioners, are also entitled to claim as descendants of Rupekatau. I am not claiming that we should have any larger interest, because of that fact through him, but what I desire to say to the Committee is this: that we have not only rights through the ancestor Tuperiri, but a second and further right through the ancestor Rupekatau, the uncle of Tuperiri. Tuperiri begot Paewhenua. The evidence I am giving is contained in the Auckland Minute-book No. 7. Paewhenua married Paretaua. I do not think I need say any more about that until I come to be cross-examined by my opponents. I may then have something to say. I want to show that Eruene Pairimu had rights. Haekopa married Titoki, so as to trace right down. Whakaariki married Paretaua, who was a younger brother of Paewhenua and also descendant of Tuperiri, and begot Uruamo. No one at the present time living can possibly deny this statement. The mana of Toukararai was the ancient mana or right to the land. Now, as Rupekatau was an elder brother, what difference can there possibly have been between them as to a right? That is all I wish to say as to that. I will now deal with another question. The hapu named Ngatimarua was the hapu of renown and bravery of the Ngati-Whatua Tribe. It was through their prowess that Ngati-Whatua obtained their land, right throughout the Kaipara district and down to Tamaki. This is borne out by the evidence contained in the Court minute-books. It will be found in Books 9 and 10, and Book 2 of the Kaipara district. Now, Marua had four children, their names being Muri-whakaroto, Te Atiakura, Potapuaka, and Marua. Now, I myself can claim descent from each of these four ancestors. Paora family mentioned in the petition also descends from each of these ancestors. It will be found stated in the Court minute-books that Ngatimarua was the prowess and bravery, renown, &c., amongst the Ngati-Whatua Tribe. I give this evidence in order to illustrate the fact that these were the people through whose prowess, bravery, and so forth we as descendants obtained the right we claim, and which we now hold at the present day. I do not claim that we should have more than the other descendants of Tuperiri, but wish to show that we have this right, in addition to the descent from Tuperiri. That is all I have to say about that. I think this statement that I have already made will show that we, the petitioners, have moral rights, are entitled to further directions, and have greater mana than those who are now in the land and selling to Europeans. There are eleven heads of families amongst we petitioners—that is to say, women who are the mothers of families. Now, amongst my opponents there are only six women who are the mothers of families. I will ask the Committee to take into consideration that fact—that children are being born day by day. The Council's Act was framed for that particular purpose—for providing for purposes such as this. What was the object of that Act—I mean the Maori Councils Act? The Acts have been passed by Parliament for the purpose of upholding and assisting and furthering the welfare of the Maori race. I say that if those Acts were passed with that intention on the part of the Government when they passed them—namely, the upholding and the furthering of the interests of the Maori people—then this is a particular case in which this should be done. Now, I hope and pray that this Government, seeing that I have been for a long time past contesting with the other Government—eight years now—without any means of support, will, and that the present Committee will, give due consideration to this petition, as in the case in ancient times when certain persons journeyed towards Jerusalem. Now, if certain persons were lying by the side of road and were taken no notice of, and a strange person came along who was not in such a violent hurry to get to Jerusalem as those who were relatives of the wounded man, but if he stopped and attended to these persons, and from that time down to this the action of that strange man has been recalled and still continues so to be—as a Maori saying which says, “We have been lost but now are found”—I am trying to evidence what I have to say: Joseph was persecuted by his elder brothers, and they were about to throw him into the pit when they changed their mind and sold him to a party of travellers. Well, that is somewhat similar to the present position—my ancestors were thrown out and should have been included, and I therefore hope and pray that we may be succoured and saved, as was done by the Government of Egypt to that person to whom I refer. Now, I desire to thank the Committee exceedingly for the kind and patient hearing which it has given to me during this long statement which I have made. I did not speak to such great lengths on my similar petition of last year, but the Chairman of the Committee of last year said that what I then stated was perfectly clear. But when the Committee came to vote upon the question of my petition of last year my petition was thrown out by five votes to four. I then presented my same petition to the Legislative Council, and the finding of the Committee of the Legislative Council was a recommendation that the Government should hold an inquiry into the circumstances. Again I thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, for the kind and patient hearing which you have given me, and I hope that any thrusts that may be made against