

that there was no possibility of a settlement with Hunia at Pipiriki, because he demanded a portion of the lake. There was no mention of a hundred acres at the meeting. Wirihana demanded a portion of the lake in addition to the 3,000 acres. His whole contention was as to the fishing rights in the lake. The allocation of the 3,000 acres was mentioned. It was to be on the southern side of the Hokino Stream. We did not get to the extent of boundaries when Fraser and Wirihana left the house, and when they returned Wirihana made his request for the lake, which was not agreed to by Kemp and the people. The people agreed to give the 3,000 acres after the explanation by Kemp and myself that it would put a stop to expensive litigation. No one at Pipiriki suggested that the Hunia family should be offered less than 3,000 acres, but there was a great deal of discussion before the people would agree. It was done on our strong representation only. The tribe did not admit the right of the Hunia family at all. My opinion always has been that Kawana Hunia had not as much right as any individual resident of Muaupoko. My opinion is based on evidence given by the Hunias themselves, by others on their behalf, and by the Muaupoko. The Hunias call themselves Ngatipariri. They are descendants of Pariri, no doubt. Kaewa was Wirihana's grandmother. She was a woman of notoriety. She was the wife of a Ngatiraukawa man. Then she was the wife of Te Hakeke. I am giving you now what I have heard, not what I know. Te Hakeke, I should be inclined to say, from what I know of Ngatiapa, would have very little time to be on friendly terms with Muaupoko. I never heard that he was at enmity with them. The information I have gained as to the relative positions of Kemp and Kawana Hunia is from Kemp's side mostly, but I have heard it from both sides. It was not on account of the right of the Hunia family that I agreed to 3,000 acres being given them. It was because I knew that they were in a position to put us to a great deal of expense and trouble that I agreed to it. I was not present at the Court of 1886, but, judging by the evidence, I should say that Warena was not put into No. 11 with the assent of the people. The weight of evidence goes to show that he was put in against the wish of the people. They did not apply for a rehearing.

Cross-examined by Mr. Baldwin.

*Witness* : I was acting with Baker for Kemp in the Court of 1890. Assisted him to sum up Kemp's case. After the evidence had been taken, Baker continued to act until end of case. I ceased to act for Kemp on receipt of the letter I have put in. Did not see Kemp about it. I communicated with Ru Reweti on the subject. I acted for Kemp for over two years. I see it stated in evidence that I offered the Hunias a large sum of money for their share of No. 11. No one was more surprised than I was when I saw it. I had no instructions at time of Pipiriki meeting to say that the list for No. 6 had not been settled. I judged that they had not been definitely settled, because a wrong list had been put into Court. I was not told by Kemp or any one on his behalf that the list for No. 6 had never been definitely settled. I said at Pipiriki that the transfer of No. 6 could not be made until we had a proper list of names, and until the trouble about No. 11 was settled. Kemp and Ru Reweti both told me that a list of persons entitled to ownership in No. 6 did exist, but they could not give it to me when I wanted it. I am not able to say that Kemp ever told me that a list of names for No. 6 had been definitely settled, or that no list had been settled. I told Ngataahi at Pipiriki that No. 6 could not be transferred until list of names was settled, and until troubles about No. 11 were over. [Donald Fraser's evidence before Supreme Court at Wanganui read, *re* proposed arrangement between Kemp and Hunia.] I certainly never heard that anything of that kind ever took place. I do not believe it. [Further extract from Donald Fraser's evidence read.] It is absolutely incorrect. There are many statements in what you have read which are absolutely untrue. Mr. Donald Fraser's memory has played him false. Down to the present moment there has never been any reference whatever to fees payable to me made by Kemp or by any person on Kemp's behalf. There is no guarantee by Kemp or by any person on Kemp's behalf to pay me my fees.

Cross-examined by Henare Apatari.

*Witness* : I was agent for Kemp from March, 1890, till July, 1892, both in and out of Court. I was at Pipiriki meeting. I saw Te Paki and Waata Muruahi speak at the meeting. Waata Muruahi did not say what he stated to the Royal Commission. I remember him welcoming the guests to Pipiriki and speaking of the settlement of the No. 11 block. He also referred to the fact that when the divisions took place in 1886 he was at Parihaka. The main part of his address was a welcome to Paki and other strangers to Pipiriki. I have a very distinct recollection of Waata Muruahi speaking. He is one of the principal men at Pipiriki. If Ru Reweti said he did not speak at the meeting he must have forgotten. I have heard Kemp say in Court and out of Court that Te Paki, Iritana, and sisters had good claims to Horowhenua.

Cross-examined by Hamuera Karaitiana.

*Witness* : I know Nireaha Tamaki well. I saw him at the meeting at Pipiriki in 1891. I know Karena te Mana o Tawhaki well. He was at the meeting. If these two people tell the truth they will make the same statement that I have. I repeat that I had never heard it stated that Kemp was a trustee in No. 14 until I came to Levin to attend this Court. I was present when Kemp gave his evidence at the Court of 1890. I did not hear him say that No. 14 was not his but that he was a trustee. I have heard his evidence read during these proceedings, but the fact that it appears in the minute-book would not make me believe it. Neither the Judge nor the Clerk understood Maori, and it is possible a mistake may have been made in the interpretation. I cannot conceive his giving such evidence, as he has always informed me that No. 14 was his own, and that he held No. 11 as trustee. I have heard the evidence given in this Court as to No. 14.

*Mr. McDonald* (through Court) : The evidence discloses the fact that Kaewa was taken prisoner by the Ngatiraukawa while she was the wife of Te Hakeke. My reply to Mr. Stevens was not an attempt to revive the calumny in relation to Kaewa.