

defined, and when the names of the owners are ascertained, to have the title made to the Government under the Act of 1877. (4.) The land to be proclaimed so as to prevent other people interfering.

I send draft conveyance herewith. You must attend to the other matters. Mr. Rolleston should be asked to prepare himself for the possibility of having to spend a little more money to get signaturés and consents, and also to buy the interests of any Natives who may be found by the Court to have an interest in the lakes, and who may not yet have sold. The papers have been with me for a week or two, but I have been so much pressed with other work that I allowed them to sleep, seeing that no request was made to me to make haste.

12th July, 1881.

W. MILLER LEWIS.

---

No. 31.

For the Solicitor General.

In reference to the interview I had with you and Mr. Fitzgerald on the subject of the Wairarapa Lakes' case, will you now advise what course is best to be taken.

21st June, 1881.

W. ROLLESTON.

---

No. 32.

The Assistant Law Officer.

Will you prepare draft conveyance to the Crown of the lands intended to be conveyed by the existing Wairarapa Lake deed. The necessary particulars must be obtained from the Native Department. I will settle same with you, and further advise the Native Minister.

22nd June, 1881.

W. S. REID.

---

No. 33.

Mr Gill.

DRAFT herewith, and some remarks of mine within.

12th July, 1881.

W. MILLER LEWIS.

---

No. 34.

(Telegrams).

Wellington, 23rd October, 1882.

No. 1073.—Returned from Greytown Saturday evening for the original deeds of land-purchase round the lake and other documentary information. The boundary of the lake as shown on plan before the Court is disputed. The claimants have admitted all counter-claimants (five hapus) as owners with them. This is another way of frustrating a settlement, as an order made including all comers will at least carry in the certificate 200 names. There is great jealousy respecting the payment of the £800, 1876, by Mr. Maunsell. The deed was signed by only thirteen Natives, half of whom were men of no note. The better way in my opinion to settle the matter would be to buy out all the disputants or owners as found by the Court. I am not certain that this can be done, but it is the only course I see open to a final settlement. If you will approve of £1,000 for these purposes, I will do what I can, purchasing for as much less as possible. No money to be paid until the Court makes an order of ownership to the Natives and subsequently an order to Her Majesty. If it cannot be so arranged, then I propose to summons the Natives who signed the deed of 1876, and force them to prove themselves owners; then to request the Court to vest their interest in Her Majesty. By this some ten or twelve undivided interests may be got. Please reply to Greytown, as I leave for there this afternoon.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Auckland.

R. J. GILL.

---

No. 35.

Auckland, 24th October, 1882.

I AM afraid I do not understand the position the lake question has got into with the Court. If 200 names are put in the certificate, how can the Court vest lake in the Crown without the consent of all; and is that consent likely to be got by an average payment of two or three pounds per owner. I will authorise the expenditure of the £1,000 you want, but I should be sorry to find the money paid and the title of the Government as far from being perfect as ever.

R. J. Gill, Esq., Greytown.

JOHN BRYCE.

---

No. 36.

Auckland, 24th October, 1882.

I THINK the latter of the two courses proposed by you is the best. The former is scarcely likely to lead to a settlement, as if there are to be 200 names on the order of the Court, £1,000 is not likely to satisfy them. I do not see why the Court should admit names without being satisfied of ownership, especially when the motive for admitting them appears on the face of things to be little less than fraudulent.

Richard J. Gill, Esq., Greytown North.

JOHN BRYCE.

---

No. 37.

Greytown North, 24th October, 1882.

I WOULD ask you to reconsider your decision on the lake question. It is a heart-burning matter to the settlers round the lake, and a payment of three times the sum I mentioned would not be excessive considering all the value of interest involved. The money would only be paid on an order from the Court vesting the upper and lower lakes in Her Majesty. It therefore does not matter whether there are 200 or only twenty owners. The latter course I proposed in my yesterday's telegram should only be adopted when all other means have failed. The Court has no other work, and has adjourned till to-morrow. Please reply to-day.

Hon. John Bryce, Auckland,

R. J. GILL.