

64. *Mr. Hislop.*] Have you a copy of the manifesto by Dr. Buller?—There is a copy in the records of the office, I believe.
65. Has that Hoahi Nahe's name on it?—I believe not.
66. What is the date of it?—I cannot remember the date without reference to the paper.
67. Have you any idea; was it last March?—It appeared about July or August, I think.
68. Then upon what do you base your statement that the Maoris repudiated Dr. Buller's appearance for them?—I base that upon information I have received as Under Secretary of the Native Department.
69. *Mr. M'Lean.*] How did you come by that information?—It was reported to me by someone in connection with the prisoners, I forget for the moment by whom, that Dr. Buller had visited the prisoners with this manifesto, and that they stated they did not wish to have anything to do with it; they trusted entirely to Te Whiti.
70. That was in connection with counsel?—They did not want any counsel.
71. You say you saw that manifesto, can you remember the names on it?—I have seen the manifesto, but cannot call to mind all of the names just now.
72. You saw the names of Tairaroa and Wi Parata?—Yes.
73. There is a number of others?—Yes. There is Major Kemp, and a number of others.
74. When you saw the manifesto was not that sufficient justification for Dr. Buller's being employed by those chiefs, some of them being from the West Coast themselves?—The manifesto I got was, I think, sent to me by Dr. Buller, and I brought it before the Native Minister as a piece of Native information. I considered so far as the manifesto was concerned, that Dr. Buller was acting against the interests of the Government.
75. But what I want to get out of you is your justification for the statement that you did not think Dr. Buller was recognised by the Maori prisoners or their representatives?—I expressed that simply as a matter of opinion from information I had received with regard to the prisoners, and I have stated my ground for believing the information.
76. *Mr. Dick.*] Mr. Sievwright has sent in his account for £377?—Yes.
77. Do you consider from the arrangements made with Mr. Sievwright that the country is liable for the whole £377?—I do not think I can give an opinion upon the matter, because except in passing the voucher, I had no official knowledge of the service.
78. *Mr. Gisborne.*] Can you let the Committee have a copy of this manifesto?—Yes.
79. *Mr. Wood.*] Have you Mr. Sievwright's account?—I believe it is attached to the papers. The witness was thanked for his attendance, and withdrew.

WEDNESDAY, 10TH DECEMBER, 1879.

Mr. WILLIAM SIEVWRIGHT, of Messrs. Sievwright and Stout, was examined.

Considerable alterations having been made in this evidence by the witness when revising, the portions struck out by him are printed in erased type, and the new matter written in by him printed in italic.

80. *The Chairman.*] The subject under consideration by this Committee is the payment that was made by the Government, through Mr. Hoani Nahe, to provide funds for the defence of the Native prisoners in Wellington. There is some correspondence with you in the papers, and the Committee would wish to obtain from you some information. You are familiar with all this?—Yes, I had some correspondence with the Government.

81. The minute says, "I authorize Mr. Sievwright to receive this £300 through Hoani Nahe." In the evidence that is before the Committee there appear certain accounts of yours, acknowledgments by you for this money, and also receipts given to you by Mr. Rees. You are aware of the circumstances, of course?—Of course I am; I paid Mr. Rees.

82. Is Mr. Rees still retained for the defence of these prisoners?—I do not understand so. I should call upon him when required, but I am not quite sure whether it is defence of the prisoners exactly. It may have been meant for that, but what I understood he was employed for was the claims of Natives on the West Coast which were to be investigated.

83. You took your instructions from Hoani Nahe?—He was present in my office, and I understood that the whole thing was authorized by him. The first person who ever spoke to me upon the subject was Mr. Rees himself, and he seemed to have been instructed by Hoani Nahe to do so.

84. Who spoke to you?—Mr. Rees spoke to me.

85. Did you understand that Mr. Rees had been instructed by Hoani Nahe to communicate with you?—Certainly, that was the way I was communicated with first.

86. It was not you, in your professional capacity, who selected Mr. Rees?—Under instructions from Hoani Nahe I retained Mr. Rees.

87. But not of your own motion?—I considered it probable that from his large knowledge of Native matters that he was the best man to be got.

88. I want to know whether it was at the instance of Hoani Nahe that you retained Mr. Rees?—Certainly, it was.

89. Was it with the consent of the Native prisoners?—I do not know whether the Natives consented.

90. You knew nothing of the relations between Hoani Nahe and the prisoners in connection with this defence?—How do you mean?

91. I mean to say you did not know whether he was authorised by the Natives to instruct anyone for the defence?—~~Except from his own instructions and the conversation I had with Mr. Rees upon the matter.~~ I had no negotiations with the Natives myself.

92. When you gave Mr. Rees this retainer what were the terms of it; what was he retained for? I apprehend, though I am not a lawyer myself, that it is customary when counsel is retained to know what he is retained for?—I think you will find that the receipts which Mr. Rees gave me will shew what he was retained for.

Mr. Sievwright.
10th Dec. 1879.