included in the Rohe Potae, and the few blocks outside that have been acquired, or a portion of them made inalienable by the Native Land Court.

1005. In relation to lands that have been restricted or alienated, is the whole of these lands necessary for the support of the Maoris?—I should say not by any means. In all large purchases we made excessive reserves rather than that anything should be said about the Natives having been left landless.

1006. Then, with regard to these other lands which you say are made inalienable by order of the Court, would you say they are largely in excess of the present wants of the Natives?—In many cases they are. I am speaking of this district.

1007. Then, with advantage to the Natives themselves and the public, a large portion of such lands might be leased or sold for the benefit of the Natives?—Yes.

1008. Now, in regard to the method of dealing, do you think that it is possible to carry on, supposing this land were thrown open in large areas, with large numbers of owners, the restrictions being taken off—do you think it possible in the existing state of the law to complete the titles without immense expense and trouble?—Of course, trouble and expense are always involved where there is a large number of signatures to be obtained. We have always, however, been able to get a good percentage of the signatures—say, 75 per cent.—and we have always been able to get a survey-subdivision for the non-sellers.

1009. But are you aware that every such division has been upset by recent decisions?—We hold these lands under Land Transfer titles.

1010. It does not matter; they will all be caveated. Some of them have been caveated after fifteen years. It is held now by the Supreme Court and by the Court of Appeal that, although an order may have been made by the Native Land Court, after subdivision, in favour of Europeans, that that was not legal, and that the order should have gone to the Natives. That is the present position?—Then that capsizes every title.

1011. Yes; it quashes nearly every title in the North Island?—Then it is a very disastrous state of things for the colony.

1012. In such cases, where the dealings have been just and fair between the parties, and where there is merely some technical dispute, do you think it would be wise and just for a tribunal to be set up clothed with power to make the titles valid to all intents and purposes?—Undoubtedly.

1013. And in cases where the disputes between the Natives and Europeans are not merely upon technical points, but real disputes of any nature whatever, do you think it would be a good thing that a tribunal should be erected which should have power to finally close up such matters and to give titles in accordance with what it considered just and right?—There are no disputes worth speaking of in this district. On the East Coast there might be one or two, but here there is none except that one, now settled, of Walker's, of which I made mention. In fact, I was going to say there has been no Native-land purchase disputed here, and I do not think there is any by the Natives on this side.

1014. You were present this morning when the Commissioners were examining Judge Puckey?—Yes.

1015. Do you think that in the case of any large holding, in which large numbers of people are interested, if these people publicly resolved upon their reserves, and upon so much of the land being either sold or leased, it would then be a wise plan to allow these sales or leases to be conducted by representative people acting in conjunction with a Government officer, so that the titles might be completed cheaply and easily- that is to say, if the Natives consented to such an arrangement?—I cannot say that I would be sanguine of that.

1016. But if the Natives consented to it, it would be advantageous to the public?—Yes, where you are dealing with large areas.

1017. Do you consider it would be possible, in cases of large areas with great numbers of owners—in rough country especially—to individualise the title to such land without the whole value of the land being absorbed by the costs of the survey and other incidental expenses?—Not to personally individualise; but it might be possible to individualise for hapus without the whole value of the land being absorbed in that way. In the case of the Wharepuhunga Block of 137,000 acres for instance, I should say there would be very little difficulty and comparatively little expense in individualising the hapu rights—say there were four, five, or even six hapus represented. It would entail very little trouble to divide it even into blocks of 15,000 acres each—that is to say, in Court.

1018. Comparatively little expense, I suppose, would be entailed by such surveys?—Yes.

1019. Supposing that were done, how many people on an average would there be in a hapu?—I think the number of adult grantees in the whole block is about six hundred.

1020. And how about children?—three hundred or three hundred and fifty children. Nearly nine hundred people interested, including the children.

1021. Then a subdivision such as you think would be advantageous would be a subdivision into blocks of 15,000 and 20,000 acres with an average of ane hundred and fifty people in each?—Very often we make a separate reserve for the children, unless it is absolutely inalienable for the whole tribe.

1022. Would it be advisable to further subdivide the land in order to give each person a separate piece?—I should say not.

1023. Then you would consider the unit of subdivision to be the hapu?—Yes, or the family.

1024. That is in accordance with Native custom?—Yes. It would be almost impossible to individualise individual rights. Where you have five and six brothers and sisters to deal with, how could you individualise their interests?

1025. There is no such thing in Native custom?—No.

1026. Having reduced the title, then, to the individual hapu, do you not think the hapu might allow its chiefs—some of its leading people—to act for the hapu in conjunction with a Government