

71. How many were on the list of names that asked that this land should be investigated?—There was Te Heuheu and some others. I do not know the whole of them.

72. Was it the first investigation or the second that you petitioned about?—Both the first and the second.

73. What was wrong in the first investigation?—It was in the Court making their award while we were absent. Those people who were there had arranged as to whom the block was to be awarded, and, having done so, presented their claims to the Court. The thing was not arranged between the two or three contending parties, but arranged between those who were present in the Court. The other objection was owing to the objection raised by the Court to let us reopen the case.

74. Were the names of all the ancestors included in these blocks?—No; the Ngatiraukawa ancestors were not included. The only name of the Ngatiraukawa was that of Tuwharetoa.

75. What was your object in reopening the case again?—So that our tribe should get a fair share of the property.

76. Were you not sent for to arrange matters in the Committee held outside the Court?—I was referred to by the Committee of the Ngatituwharetoa to arrange matters. The Graces were also there. They went on to urge them to allow the Ngatiraukawa, or their ancestors, to be admitted. They would not agree to that. I went back to the Court. A day or two afterwards they said they had no opportunity of getting into the Court, and the matter was sent back to the Committee.

77. What was your opinion as to the reason why the Court would not agree to hear you?—Because it seemed to support Te Heuheu's people and the Graces. That appeared to me to be what the Graces were doing every day I was there, for when I went to dispute before the Committee they were there; if I went before the Court I found them there also.

78. How do you know that the interpreter did not give the right interpretation?—I heard it from Mr. Brookfield.

79. From whom did Mr. Brookfield hear that the interpreter did not give the right interpretation?—He heard it from Mr. Davis, a native interpreter.

80. Do you know the ancestral boundaries of that block?—I know the boundaries belonging to my own people.

81. If you know of any discrepancy in the first award you had better relate it?—I do not know anything further than what I have already related.

82. In the division of the block, were the divisions wrongly made in regard to ancestral rights?—I objected also as to the external boundaries between some of the hapus. I commenced to make my objections as to the boundary called Pouakani. There are no such boundaries as were awarded or made by the Court (that is, for external boundaries) commencing at Tapararoa; the boundary-line is a straight line from Tapararoa to Pouakani, thence to the Waikato River, or to the source of the Waipa Stream. I objected because some of our land was included in what was awarded to Ngatituwharetoa; and the portion to the south-east was given to Ngatiraukawa.

83. Was that the reason why you asked for a reinvestigation to take place for that portion of the block?—Yes.

84. When this second investigation took place, to what did you object?—The first objection I had to make was the award made to Ngatiraukawa; that was one of the first wrongs; the other objection was given the second time, and was that the Ngatiraukawa were admitted again into another block.

85. Who were the Ngatiraukawa that were admitted?—It was owing to the ancestor's name, Wairangi, for he was in no way related to Tuwharetoa or to Tia. He belonged altogether to Ngatiraukawa.

86. Do you think these persons would have a right to that portion of the block?—Ngatiraukawa would have a claim according to the award made by the Court.

87. What is the reason, in your opinion, that the Court allowed them to become claimants to that portion of the block?—I believe it was because these Natives had received money from Government owing to the action of the Graces in the second instance.

88. Do you know that, or is it only hearsay?—I saw it myself.

89. Did you inform the Court that you had cemeteries in that portion of the block?—Yes; we told them where our cemeteries were situated; we pointed out our houses, our cultivations, our fortifications: the Ngatiraukawa explained where their cemeteries were, also their houses, cultivations, and former fortifications; and when the Assessors and the interpreters went on to the land to see if the boundaries were right they found that what we stated in Court was perfectly correct.

90. And that the evidence of the opposite parties in these respects was incorrect?—Yes; the Assessors and the interpreters told the opposite parties that what I said was correct. But what they brought forward—the marks or signs of cultivations—were nowhere to be found. When the matter was before the Court it made its award quite contrary; it awarded us but small portions of the block notwithstanding that our representations were correct as regards our claims on account of long residence and various other grounds. It also included Ngatiwairangi, about two hundred of them, in the places which were awarded to us.

91. Did you hear Grace say anything about the land being awarded to Ngatiwairangi?—I heard it stated that Grace should say that the greater part of the block was going to be awarded to Ngatiwairangi. That is what we thought; that Grace and the Government had the whole management of the matter, and they awarded where and to whom they thought proper.

*The Chairman:* The Court could not have done anything outside the evidence.

92. *Mr. Taipua:* Did your people receive any money from the Government?—No, none at all.

*The Chairman:* If they did they could not go in for a rehearing.