To return to the subject. I think that for some time the Rohe Potae will in itself be sufficiently important to constitute such a district as to require the attention of a permanent staff of the Court to deal with it solely until disposed of, which Court should be centrally situated, as Otorohanga is. That, when application for investigation of title is made to the Court, and where there are several applications, they should be taken in rotation, without favour to one applicant more than another. That, when an application is taken by the Court, and such application embraces an area in which there may be several ancestors with divided interests, or said to have ancestral boundaries, the Court shall, if practicable, settle these internal boundaries at the same time as the external boundary; but should it for good reasons be inexpedient for the Court to go into the internal boundaries at the same time, then the external boundary should be first settled, and immediately afterwards the internal boundaries. After these are fixed, with its ancestors, then only should the list of names be taken, indicating the individual interests at the same time. This, of course, applies where the individual interests are intimated as being unequal, which should be done at the outset; and where no such intimation is given, the shares shall be deemed to be equal, and the Court shall allot them as such. In any case, no block shall be disposed of till the individual interests are allotted—I mean indicated as one share, half-share, &c. And in a month thereafter, if no rehearing has been applied for, and a correct survey has been made, then the block should be considered negotiable for sale or purchase, and not before.

In dealing with lists of names, no person not having an ancestral right, or occupation, or those desired to be admitted by Maori *aroha*, shall be admitted. Such persons have swelled out lists to an abnormal extent, which can now be seen in Rohe Potae lists (in their perfection). Such names often become subsequently the most troublesome of all, and multiply difficulties in subsequent dealings with the land, and takes up a considerable amount of the time of the Court. My experience has been that too ready a compliance has been manifested by the Court in such cases.

There is also a very important question of children. I hold that minors should have the right legally to be admitted with the same legal privileges as adults. The law as at present on this point is unjust. Greed commends it, and children are subject to be made paupers. It is not according to Maori custom, though readily taken advantage of by persons without children. I have known instances where minors have been excluded and their parents alone admitted, and I have known those parents to be so unnatural as to have disposed of their interests, leaving to their children only the miserable pittance they could not dispose of, and practically landless. Children's interests also should be protected until they attain their majority; and I think it also the duty of the State to erect safeguards, that their estate is not misconducted and squandered. When Natives lived as Natives under their customs and usages children were never said to have no interest in the land; in fact, paternal instincts were so strong in respect to their children, that they pampered them with the idea that they were the possessors of the soil, and which they often helped to hold against aggression, long before they were twenty-one years of age. This trait was characteristic of the ancient Maori, and was a prevailing custom in their commonwealth—the parents sinking into the position of guardians.

In voluntary arrangements made by Natives themselves out of Court, and which may appear to be all but settled among themselves, but for some well-defined points, and which may, perhaps, be the only difference between them, provision should be made for the submitting of such points to the Court, the stating of case, and the taking of evidence on the disputed points alone, without bringing in a whole mass of unnecessary evidence, the Court to confine the evidence and decide upon those points, and in judgment incorporating the same with the arrangement voluntarily agreed upon. This course will give facilities for shortening cases which would otherwise have stretched out to indefinite lengths. In fact, in all cases and all arguments before the Court, the Court should confine the party or parties to the points bearing on the subject.

As to rehearings, one month is quite enough time in which to apply for a rehearing, appellant stating clearly grounds of application, and, if it appears to the Chief Judge that those grounds are frivolous and without good reasons, in such case the Chief Judge should have power to dismiss the same without a hearing. In any case rehearings should be confined to points of appeal, and judgments on rehearing should be confined to the question at issue, and, where the grounds of appeal are limited, the original order should also be only affected in a limited degree.

In the foregoing remarks you will no doubt have noticed that I have offered very little new which is in the form of legislation, and what has been written so far has related principally to procedure before the Court. I have always consistently held the opinion, and I expressed it, I think, to you when you were in Otorohanga, that the present Land Court laws remodelled, condensed, and with some additions, is all that is required for investigation of title—that any new Act will necessarily be built upon the present ones, rejecting such sections as are bad and mischievous. You will see when I am writing under the second heading (the dealing with Native lands) such clauses which of necessity should be struck out. They will suggest themselves and appear self-apparent. Such sections as section 12, "Land Court Act, 1888;" in the Frauds Prevention Acts, and other kindred sections.

In short, a carefully-framed Act, with necessary additions, administered by a competent and energetic staff properly constituted, is all that is required for investigation of title. Indeed, in my experience, so important has the question of procedure appeared to me, that, however admirable the superstructure may be, it will be useless without a proper and vigorous administration.

Before quitting this part of the subject, I cannot help but reiterate that Judges other than Maori scholars and adepts, if possessing legal training, will interpret the law best of all. They are more critical and literal in examining evidence, not so partial to parties, and certainly not so indolent as the old order. They should be conversant with just sufficient of Maori customs as to administer the law in accordance with recognised customs and usages. This leads me to remark that great judgment should be exercised in the choice of competent interpreters, as it is of the greatest importance