

McDonald's position was in regard to any particular hapu. In the early correspondence, so far as I can see, the general division appears to be into sellers and non-sellers.

312. Seeing that the Court awarded the bulk of the block to the sellers, did not Mr. McDonald insist that land and money also should be given to certain of the non-sellers?—Yes; but you now refer to another matter—the subject of a subsequent arrangement between certain Natives and the Government.

313. Are you aware that the result of these negotiations was that a sum of money—about £4,000—was paid to the Ngatikaupara?—I am aware that a sum of money, about that amount, was paid to certain Natives; but that had nothing to do with Dr. Featherston's previous payments on account of rents impounded.

314. And that some land was also given to these people?—I am aware of that; but I cannot charge my memory with either the exact amount of money or the quantity of land.

315. *Mr. Bryce.*] Was that distinct from Dr. Featherston's payments?—Yes; as I have said, that was altogether distinct from Dr. Featherston's payment.

316. *Mr. Te Ao.*] You say that was quite distinct from Dr. Featherston's payments?—Yes.

317. Seeing that Mr. McDonald's negotiations resulted in money and land being given to the Ngatikaupara, how was it that no money was given to the Himatangi people, who were also large sellers?—I do not see how I can answer that question.

*Mr. Bryce:* I submit that that question has nothing whatever to do with the subject of this inquiry.

*The Chairman:* I was about to say so. I cannot see what Mr. Te Ao is aiming at; but I thought his question might have some drift.

318. *Mr. Te Ao.*] Do you think that any part of the Himatangi money was included in the money paid to Ngatikaupara?—It was a distinct matter altogether.

319. The reason I ask you this particular question is this: You stated in your evidence that rent-money had been paid to a number of Natives; therefore I asked you whether any portion of the £4,000 was paid to the Himatangi people?—The two matters are altogether distinct. The matter you allude to does not in any way refer to these payments by Dr. Featherston on account of rents.

320. I repeat the question because I want it to be clear. Can you inform me what hapus received the Himatangi rents?—I have no other information than what is contained in the papers before the Legislative Council in 1881.

321. Have you seen the report adopted by the Native Affairs Committee of the Legislative Council, recommending that this money should be returned to the Himatangi Natives?—Yes.

322. *Mr. Hakuene.*] Has any money been paid to the Natives since that £4,000?—Any Natives?

*Colonel Trimble:* He means the Natives in that block.

323. *Mr. Hakuene.*] Has any money been paid to any of the hapus since that £4,000 was paid to the Ngatikaupara?—I am not aware that any money has been paid. I believe not.

324. You think that no money besides that £4,000 has been paid?—I would add to my previous answer, if the Committee will allow me, that I am afraid some confusion will arise by bringing into this matter payments made in connection with other transactions, which are quite distinct. The payment referred to by Mr. Hakuene refers to another large question.

*The Chairman:* Mr. Hakuene is bringing in a subject which is not before us.

*Colonel Trimble:* The notes will create the greatest confusion if that is done.

325. *Mr. Hakuene.*] Do you quite understand why Dr. Featherston held back the Himatangi rents?—What back rents do you refer to?

326. I mean this £500?—My object in asking Mr. Hakuene to be specific was that I might explain what was the actual position of the matter. Dr. Featherston's letter, to which allusion has been made, refers to general amounts which he held back because at the time the Natives were not ready to receive them. These amounts were subsequently distributed. The £500 which is the subject of this petition does not represent any amount that was held back from the Natives. The total amount of £4,699 12s. 1d. represented what was due from European occupiers of the Rangitikei-Manawatu Block. From time to time a portion of the money was paid to the Natives by Dr. Featherston irrespective of whether it had been received from the lessees or not. Altogether the Treasury accounts show that £4,633 10s. was thus distributed. The total amount received from the lessees was £1,971. These amounts were recovered as they could be got.

327. *Colonel Trimble.*] Did the Government lose the balance?—Yes.

328. How much?—The Government paid £2,662 8s. 2d. more than they received.

329. *Mr. Pere.*] Was £4,699 the total of the rent-money due?—Yes.

330. Was any part of that £4,699 paid to the Himatangi?—Mr. Pere was not in the room when I quoted letters, which appeared to show that there was a general participation by them.

331. You only think that they received them?—I believe they received a share of the rents, and I think that Parakaia gave authority to receive the portion of himself and his people. *Mr. McDonald's* letter, I think, shows that.

332. Are you prepared to say that the signature of "Parakaia" to that document is a genuine one?—I have no doubt of it.

333. What reason have you for supposing that it is a genuine one?—The reason is that it has been seen by persons who knew Parakaia's signature well, and they say there is no doubt about it.

334. Have not the Government any letters or papers from Parakaia, so that we could compare them?—Very likely; but the genuineness of this signature has not before been questioned. I showed the letter to Dr. Buller some time ago, and he, to the best of my belief, said that it was Parakaia's signature; that there could be no mistake about the genuineness of the signature.

335. Do you think that that is a genuine document, and that the people whose names appear here each signed his name?—Mr. Pere well knows that in 1869, when that document was written, a chief would consider himself entitled to sign the names of all his people if he thought fit.