

24. Assuming that that view of the matter is right, what position do you assign to the present Taueki in relation to Kemp? Is there any comparison at all between them?—I am sorry to say that my experience as a rule is that sons do not succeed to anything like either the position or in any other way to what everybody calls mana (a word of very indefinite meaning), or the power or right exercised by their father. I only know one exception, and that is Tawhiao. I can remember the position of Te Rauparaha, and when I afterwards saw the son of him—a man who grew to man's estate before his father died, who had been home to England, and was in every respect competent to exercise all the powers held by his father—I have seen him bearded in the Native Land Court by a lad whose father would not have dreamed of speaking in the presence of the old men at all. Though I have always understood that the old Maori King was a man of great influence as a chief, I believe that his son never exercised any power at all. I consider that Ihaia Taueki is the *ariki* of the tribe. Although he is the son of that great chief, and may be considered the *ariki*, he has not attempted to dispute the position or influence of Kemp—he is the superior and dominant power?—No; and he is personally, through infirmity, unable to exercise his power.

25. As to the deed of transfer from Kemp to the Wellington-Manawatu Railway Company, which, as you explained, was altered in some way, alluding to a temporary misunderstanding between yourself and Kemp: did you receive that deed so altered from my firm or from the Wellington-Manawatu Railway Company?—From the company.

26. *The Chairman.*] You said it was written in totally different ink and handwriting to that of Sir Walter Buller?—Yes; nobody could suppose it to have been made by Sir Walter Buller, or in a lawyer's office.

27. *Sir W. Buller.*] I understand that you have been appointed by the Government to represent the Muaupoko at this investigation?—I understand myself to be representing somebody, “to watch the interests of the Muaupoko Tribe, as distinguished from the interests of the chiefs, Kemp and Warena.”

28. What is the date of your letter of appointment?—28th February.

29. I believe the Government sought you; you did not seek the Government in this matter; you did not ask for employment?—No; I did not ask for employment.

30. By whom were you appointed?—Mr. McKenzie, personally.

31. Is it not a fact that Mr. McKenzie first offered to appoint you interpreter to the Commission, and you declined?—No; but it was intimated to me somewhere in the Buildings—I really forget where—that I was going to be offered the position of interpreter.

32. By some one in authority—Mr. Sheridan?—No; it was not Sheridan. I cannot say by whom; it was one of those rumours that one hears. I thought it was a *bona fide* thing.

33. Did you intimate that you would not accept the position?—Yes; to Mr. McKenzie, because I thought it would have been an improper position for me.

34. Mr. McKenzie agreed to pay you for your services?—Certainly.

35. Then, as a matter of fact, this proposal on the part of Mr. McKenzie to employ you was subsequent to your communication to Mr. O'Hara Smith about the publication of your letter?—Yes; Mr. McKenzie intimated to me that it had been represented to him by Mr. Wilson—and others, whose names I do not recollect—that, inasmuch as Sir Walter Buller, who was supposed to represent the Muaupoko, had personal and private interests in this matter, it might afterwards be said that the Muaupoko tribe had not really been represented at all, otherwise than subordinately to the personal interests of Kemp and Sir Walter Buller; and they therefore determined to appoint some one, and asked me would I take the appointment. I said, “Yes; that it would be an appointment that would give me great pleasure.”

36. You did see Mr. McKenzie personally on this subject?—Yes; once.

37. You did not know him at the time Mr. Wilson said he would like you to send the letter?—No.

38. Since being asked by Mr. Wilson to read the letter to Mr. McKenzie, you have seen him three or four times?—Yes; but not on Horowhenua business, except once.

39. Was this letter appointing you subsequent to the interviews you are telling us of?—Yes.

40. That date is two days subsequent to the date of your letter in the *Farmer*?—Yes; the *Farmer* is only published twice a week.

41. You got a type-written copy of the letter from Mr. Smith?—Yes; I received it from him before my appointment. I did not put the same date on the type-written letter as on the original.

42. You put the 27th February?—Yes; whatever date appears there.

43. Then you must have sent the letter after that to the *Farmer*?—I took it on or after the 27th February.

44. You got your letter of appointment on the 29th?—On the 28th.

45. The very day after the date you put on your letter to the *Farmer*?—Yes; I am not going to have Mr McKenzie mixed up with my letter; he had nothing whatever to do with it; nor will I be mixed up with him. I distinctly decline to have anything whatever to do with a quarrel that was going on between Mr. McKenzie and Sir Walter Buller. I have no opinion about it, and I do not care a pin for either of them. Mr McKenzie has nothing to do with my letter at all, except that Mr. Wilson expressed to me his opinion that it ought to be, as a matter of history, made known to the Minister of Lands.

46. You have told us you did meet Mr. McKenzie when he offered you the position of representing the Muaupoko: was that prior to the 28th February?—Yes; probably the day before or a day or two before.

47. So that, if it was the day before, it would be the day you dated the letter you sent to the *Farmer*?—No; it could not be that, because I was in Shannon and he was in Invercargill.

48. Therefore, it must have been two or three days before?—Yes; I suppose so.