

me by my friends on the other side or members of the Committee will be confined to the statement which I have made.

*The Chairman:* Has the opposing side, Ngapipi Reweti, any question to ask?

*Ngapipi Reweti:* Yes.

*The Chairman:* What is your name? *Ngapipi Reweti:* Have you any questions to ask the witness Otene Paora?—The official paragraph in the petition of the petitioners states that this petition is put forward by himself and others, thirteen in number. I want to ask him what are the names of those thirteen persons. Are they persons joined in the grant, or persons outside of that Crown grant?

*Witness:* Some of them are in as owners by succession to Hori Winiata, as the Committee will remember I stated yesterday.

1. *Ngapipi Reweti.*] The petitioner asked the Committee to uphold the decision given by Judge MacCormick. That is what he said yesterday, but he went on to say that because Judge MacCormick was born in Auckland and lived there permanently, that he knew of his own personal knowledge all the arrangements that had been made in connection with the Orakei Block. Why, then, does the petitioner ask this Committee to set aside what had been previously done by Judge MacCormick? Why, then, was this petition framed to object to the award of the Native Land Court, seeing that it was Judge MacCormick who continued these things as contained in the Crown grant, commencing from the year 1869, and which continue without alteration down to the present day?—It was not Judge MacCormick. MacCormick was a lawyer. This MacCormick had not then been a Judge, and the MacCormick to whom you refer was father of Judge MacCormick—I do not mean his actual father, but he was a member of that family.

2. *Hon. Sir J. Carroll.*] I think what he meant was, why should he disturb the action of Judge MacCormick, who confirmed and carried into effect subsequent actions dated as far back as 1869. Is that what you mean?—Yes. Judge MacCormick distinctly states in his judgment, which has been read, that a great many injustices and wrongs had been done in connection with the Orakei Block, and that he was not going to add further wrong or injustice to what had previously been done.

3. *Ngapipi Reweti.*] Seeing that Judge MacCormick in his award made no alteration in his previous awards, are you willing that that award should be upheld?—This award.

4. You say Judge MacCormick made no alteration in the award from 1869 right down?—Judge MacCormick had no power to make any variations in the previous award. The only power that Judge MacCormick had was to deal with the succession of Hori Winiata's half-share, and he says that he discovered that much injustice had been done. The Court admits now that much injustice had been done in respect to Orakei, and has no intention of doing anything that would be adding to that injustice.

5. Now, you have made a statement about the hapu called Te Urioteaotawhirangi. Now, this hapu's name is not contained in any minutes in reference to this Orakei Block. The only hapus having rights to Orakei are Te Taou Ngoho and Te Uringutu. How, then, did Te Urioteaotawhirangi obtain any right to be included, as you contend, in the Orakei Block?—In reply to that, sir, I ask to be allowed to read an extract from a decision which was given in 1869 from Decision-Book 2, Maki, and Te Wheoro case, paragraph 2, which is as follows: "The case of Maki is more doubtful. He does not appear to have lived with Apihai for a great number of years, and his claim apparently is in no way inferior to Paerimu, except that his father did not intermarry with Apihai's tribe as Hohop Parerimu did. Parerimu's wife, who gave birth to Ernena Paerimu, the claimant, was Titoki of Te Urioteaotawhirangi, the hapu of Ngaoho, to which Toukararai, whose name was often mentioned, belonged." I would point out that you will find that judgment in Orakei Minute-book No. 2. That is my answer to the question, that in the year 1869 the right of Titoki was recognized by the Court in the judgment as coming from Te Urioteaotawhirangi. If the Chairman will permit me to do so, I can at a subsequent time turn it up—the judgment which was contained in that book of important judgments of the Native Land Court.

*The Chairman:* We have it here.

*Ngapipi Reweti:* I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, to ask the petitioner, but I desire to make a statement if you will permit me.

*The Chairman:* You will get a chance to do so presently; meantime the Committee will ask Otene Paora questions.

6. *Mr. Parata.*] Is the Uruamo family descended from Toukararai?—Yes.

7. Your petition says that the two hapus were originally Te Taou and Ngaoho: did the Court find in favour of these—the original family who are descended from these two?—Yes.

8. *Hon. Sir J. Carroll.*] You say the block was originally investigated in 1869?—Yes.

9. And I think you defended the petition in 1873?—Yes.

10. What year was it in which the first petitions were presented to the House with reference to the original title?—1904. But Poata Uruamo made application in the year 1891 under the Equitable Owners Act.

11. 1891, was it not?—He made application, anyhow, under that Act, and the Court dismissed his claim.

12. And the Court threw out his claim?—Yes.

13. Do you know on what grounds?—Well, the Court held that that application did not lie under the provisions of the Equitable Owners Act.

14. It could not affect a private Act, I suppose?—The desire which we hope to establish in connection with Orakei could not have been brought forward under the Equitable Owners Act, 1886.