in entire sympathy with the claims, although, naturally enough, rather than let loose the dogs of war, as it were, in the law-courts, they preferred to rely upon the proceedings of the Native Land Court in 1868, and the Act that was passed to validate those proceedings. They preferred to look upon that as a proof that the claims had been satisfied. The two papers that follow are in 1891—Mr. Mackay's report, G.–7, and his letter, G.–7A. These were consequent upon the finding of the Joint Committee. He was appointed a Commissioner to deal with the matter and make his recommendations, in order that effect might be given to the indication that the Joint Committee had so clearly given—that further consideration ought to be shown to the long-delayed claims which the Natives had put forward. I will, just for a moment, refer to these two reports by Mr. Mackay. He adhered to the recommendation which he had previously made—namely, that an area of some 130,000 acres should be appropriated in order to satisfy the claims. However, as we know, that report has not been acted upon. The full report would take too long to read. Copies of this letter and report of Mr. Mackay's have been printed, and, I think, circulated amongst members of the House in support of the petition. Such—at some tedious length, I am afraid—gentlemen, is the position with regard to what may be called the equitable validity of the Natives' claims. The only question, therefore, to be solved by this Committee is, have those promises which were made as the consideration for the deed, apart from the money, been fulfilled, or have they been adequately fulfilled? I think, without again going over the various papers that I have referred to, the evidence from them is abundantly clear that the reservations which were originally made of 10 acres per head, although increased by the Native Land Court to 14 acres, were utterly inadequate for the purpose of liberally providing for the present and future wants of the Natives. I do not think that any reasonable man, after reading the papers to which I have referred, can come to any other conclusion. Then the other point is, whether the promises with reference to schools and hospitals and the general care on the part of the Government were adequately fulfilled. One has heard the official pronouncement on the subject by the Joint Committee in 1891, and that absolutely admitted that those promises had, for a great many years, received no attention whatever; and, as it is pathetically put in one of the reports, the time has gone past in which any compensation can make up for the neglect of those years. Of course, one suggestion might be made here as to how it was that the Natives lay by so long before they took up the persistent attitude which has been their characteristic with regard to these claims almost since 1872. The position is this: When the land was sold and the deed signed, they were promised reserves. They remained exactly as they were before any deed was signed or any land sold. There were no settlers around them then, and they still had the same privilege of roaming all over the country as they had done before any deed was heard of. And that state of things continued—lessening, of course, every year for several years afterwards; and it was only as the pressure of the surrounding settlers came upon them that they realized how they were restricted—to the narrow areas of their reserves. It was only then that they began to feel that they had parted with more than any reasonable man should have concluded they ought to part with. It was in consequence of the gradual progress of settlement that the Native began to realize how inadequate the provision made for him was. Another trouble regarding the reserves that were actually made was that, although each man was given 14 acres, the area was not all in one place. A man might have 2 acres in one settlement and 12 acres in another; and the 2 acres were absolutely useless to him. The land was split up in all sorts of ways like that, and it is quite obvious that with land in that position no successful use could be made of it. The question, then, is whether under the Landless Natives Act this adequate provision has been made. I attempted at the outset to remove the impression that this Landless Natives Act did stand in the way of the claim. The ground I took up was this: that the Act simply made provision for Natives on the footing that they were landless, and not on the footing that they had a right to a certain quantity of land. The claim now before the Committee is not based on the fact that the Natives are landless at all, but on the fact that the Natives had an equitable right given them under the deed and the promises made in 1848 to certain land—a right which I have attempted to show the Committee has never yet been satisfied. So that we are here altogether apart from the provisions of the Landless Natives Act. Of course, one realizes that in any provision that may be made as a consequence of this proceeding before the Committee credit must necessarily be given for what the Natives have received under the Landless Natives Act; but under that Act the man who already had 50 acres—the man who had signed that deed and under it had been promised reserves—does not get a yard more of land than he already held, because if he already had 50 acres he could not get anything under the Act. It is these Natives who have had reserves, and been more fortunate in that respect than their brethren, who have from time to time expended their money in endeavouring to enforce the claim. Those who had 50 acres, but have yet used their money in enforcing the claim, get nothing under the Landless Natives Act. We say that that is a point that ought to be considered. What, I may ask, is the provision that has been made under the Landless Natives Act? One recognizes that it was a beneficent Act, and that it was conceived in a spirit of benevolence and generosity. There is no doubt of that. It was an attempt made, with the limited resources in land at the disposal of the Government, to settle a long-standing grievance. But in what way, it may be asked very pertinently, has this advanced the condition of the Natives, who ought, from the year 1848, to have had reserves for their "present and future wants" available for them? The reserves which have been made under the Act lie in remote parts of the country. They are all covered with bush, and are a long distance from a railway, and are mostly not roaded. In some cases the area which each man has in this reserve is, say, 5 acres, because he happens to hold 45 acres in other places. How, may I ask, can it be conceived that the Landless Natives Act has by such reserves made provision in the sense in which reserves made in 1848 would have made provision for the Native, had they been made of a sufficient character to provide for his wants? I might—if I may be pardoned—for a moment refer to these reserves. There is a reserve at