On resuming, Mr. Williams said,—Might I be allowed to make an observation. I wish to state Mr. Williams. the grounds upon which I took my objection, not only to this list, but to the lists of previous years. I acted on the 12th clause of "The Registration of Electors Act, 1866," which states,—"The Registration Officer shall within the first seven days of the month of May make out an alphabetical list in the form numbered four in the Schedule hereto of all persons objected to as aforesaid; and if he shall have reasonable cause to believe that any person whose name shall be on the said list of voters is dead, or from any cause whatever is not entitled to be on the electoral roll in respect of any qualification stated in such list, and is not objected to, he shall insert the name of such person in the list of persons so objected to, and shall affix his name as the objector thereto." I took my stand upon that clause. Mr. Lawlor had ruled in the question of one claim that was brought forward and discussed here—an objection raised by Mr. Carleton—Mr. Lawlor in that case ruled that he, not having individualized his property, could not be retained on the list of voters, and struck him off. Acting on Mr. Lawlor's decision, the following year I objected to a number of names. They were advertised according to law, and the case was brought forward at the Revision Court; and Mr. Lawlor sustained my objection, and struck off every name I objected to. I thought then that, having established the fact, I should object in the same manner to all I had a doubt upon, many of which (some fifty or sixty) I found to be the very names struck off by Mr. Lawlor the previous year. I did not consider it part of my duty to ascertain value-I could not possibly ascertain the value; but the parties objected to should come here and prove That was the ground upon which I started with these objections; and then I acted upon Mr. Lawlor's first ruling, and commenced to object to all names I had a doubt upon, there were forty-four names in my own immediate district—Natives I knew—every one of them. I first of all objected to their names, and then, seeking advice from Mr. White, Mr. Von Stürmer, and others, I proceeded with the list of Natives strangers to me. Mr. Lawlor sustained my objections. last list came in I objected to all I had any doubt upon—not until I had obtained all the information I could possibly gain from Mr. White, Mr. Von Stürmer, and others. Why I make the observation is, that you might ask me the value of other properties. I could not give it, but could only make a guess. It appeared to me by Mr. Lawlor's ruling that it was immaterial what the value of property was if the Natives were owners of the property in common; and upon these grounds I raised my objections.

The Commissioner: No doubt, if Mr. Lawlor's decision is correct, it would be immaterial; but, if it is incorrect, it might be very material, because, although persons might be holding in common, if they owned among them property of the value of £50 to each person, it might be held, supposing Mr. Lawlor's ruling was incorrect, to entitle them to register. Yet a person applying to be registered,

where the property did not equal that per man, could not in any case claim to be registered.

Mr. Williams: I took my stand upon his ruling and acted upon it; and in the following year, when he sat here, he sustained the objections.

123. The Commissioner.] Of course, if you cannot tell me the value of the various properties, there is no use repeating the questions, but I shall have to obtain that from other evidence. In some cases it is quite possible you may be able to give it. It is only an opinion. I do not want you to give absolute value; of course that would be out of the question. I have now a parcel of claims from Hokianga. The first on the list is Hemi Te Karanua. Did you object to him?—Yes.

124. Upon what grounds?—On the ground that he held his property in common with others.

He claims on a block of land called Whakatere, in which grant there are more than a hundred

claimants.

- 125. Do you know the value of that property?—That is the same block you asked me a question about this morning.
- 126. Are you speaking from your own knowledge, or from information received?—From in-
- 127. From whom did you receive it?—Partly from my own knowledge. I objected to a great number of Natives claiming on the same block. I received my information also from Mr. Von

128. Did you object to Hohepa Taupaki Katete?—Yes.

129. On what ground?—On the same ground. He was struck off the roll the previous year. claims on Whakatere.

130. Did you object to Winiata te Kawau?—Yes.

131. What are the grounds of objection in this case?—That there were other grantees in the block. He held in common with others, and had no household qualification.

132. On your own knowledge?—From the information I obtained.
133. Did you object to Hone Katete?—Yes. He was struck off the roll the previous year.

134. On the ground that he held in common with others?—Yes.

135. Did you object to Hone Mete?—Yes; claiming in common with others.

136. On the information of the Resident Magistrate?—Yes; from the same information.

137. Did you object to Ngopera Ngakuku—block of 900 acres?—Yes; he is on the list of objections, but his name does not appear on the roll. I objected to him. He is down as an Ahipara Native, not a Hokianga.

138. Your source of information would be different, perhaps, in this case?—That name would appear in Mr. White's list.

139. What was your ground of objection in this case?—That he held his property in common. 140. On Mr. White's authority?—Yes.

- 141. Did you object to Henare te Naihi?—Yes.
- 142. Upon what ground?—Holding his property in common with others.
- 143. From whom did you get your information?—From Mr. Von Stürmer.
 144. Did you object to Pehi Neho?—Yes. He was struck off the roll in 1877. He claims on Whakatere.
 - 145. Your information is from Mr. Von Stürmer?—Yes.
 - 146. Did you object to Hami Pauapa Takirau?—Yes.

March 6, 1879.