

lands. It was not then intended that he should have the Ohau section for himself. If it had been suggested I would not have said anything. I was a Te Whiti-ite. My consent would have been this: that I would not have spoken. It was not, so far as I know, suggested to any of the tribe in 1886 that Kemp should have the Ohau section for himself.

Cross-examined by Sir Walter Buller.

*Witness*: I have taken an active part in the business of the tribe, but I have not taken part in the discussions about Horowhenua at any of the meetings. The reason I did not speak at the meetings which took place when the Court sat at Palmerston, in 1886, was that I was a Te Whiti-ite. I became a follower of Te Whiti long before the Court of 1886. I am not a Te Whiti-ite now. I ceased some time since 1886, but a long time before the Otaki Court. I had ceased visiting Parihaka at time of Pipiriki meeting, but my thoughts were still on Te Whiti. That is why I did not take part in the discussions then. I have not spoken at any of the meetings that have taken place since the Pipiriki meeting. Being a follower of Te Whiti, I did not speak at any of the meetings in Palmerston in 1886, or in the Court. My loyalty to Te Whiti prevented me going in to the Court. I did not tell the people this. They all knew that Parihaka people did not recognise Courts. I heard from the people that Mangakahia was the Assessor of the Court. I also heard after Mangakahia left that Kahui Karerehe had come. I saw him in the Court. I went into the Court three or four times, for a short time only. I did not go into Mangakahia's Court at all. I heard what the Court was doing sometimes when I was in the Court. The only business I can remember is the proceedings about No. 11 and the piece in Ihaia's name. I remember the application being made for No. 11 to be put into Kemp's name, and Wirihana asking that his name should be put in as well. The people would not consent to Wirihana's name being put in; they retired into a side-room and agreed to put Warena's name in, and the Court made the order. I came out of the Court soon after this. No. 12 was, I think, called on before I left the Court, and an application made for an order in favour of Kemp and Warena. Raniera objected, and asked that it should be left to the people to decide. I then came out of the Court. This is all I can remember of what took place in the Court. I did not take any interest in the proceedings when No. 11 was before the Court. I don't know who made the application. The proceedings had commenced when I went in. I heard Wirihana object to the order being made in Kemp's favour only. Wirihana said that if his name was not put in he would make trouble over all the divisions, and that is why Kemp agreed to put Warena's name in. I believe it was McDonald who took matters before the Court. It was in the side-room that Wirihana objected. I did not go into the room. It was when we returned to our kainga that I was told what Wirihana had said. When we returned to the kainga Wirihana said what I have told the Court. He told us that he had asked in the side-room to have his own name put in. I think this was at the kainga. [Page 33, printed evidence in Supreme Court case (Wirihana's evidence), read: "I was a long time looking at the map of subdivision, and I said to Kemp," &c.] I thought that Wirihana wanted his own name put in. That is my recollection. I was in the Court when they returned from the side-room. I heard the award of the Court to the two persons. The land vested in the two absolutely by law, but not by Maori custom. According to Maori custom it was handed over to them as chiefs, and they were to consider the tribe. I remember the Supreme Court case in Wanganui in 1894. I gave evidence in that case. [Page 36, Supreme Court evidence, read.] I remember giving that evidence. It is true. When I said that I gave up my father's bones I meant that I gave them to Kemp and Warena as chiefs. If they chose to dispose of the land that would be for them to consider. [Horowhenua Commission, page 167, questions 282 to 291, read.] I don't think that evidence is exactly as I gave it. Most of it is right, but in some parts it seems to have been misreported. [Questions read again.] I admit that I gave those replies. [Questions 292 and 293 read.] I suppose I said that, because it is printed. I remember saying it. I have said that I heard the railway, the township, and the 1,200 acres come before Mangakahia's Court. I heard this at Palmerston in 1886, and I have had them in mind since the Royal Commission. I heard them discussed and arranged at our meetings before they were taken to the Court. I was present when those three parcels were discussed, before Mangakahia's Court sat. The railway was the first, then the township. The Ohau section was third. I was sure of this before I gave evidence before the Royal Commission. [Horowhenua Commission, page 166, question 262, read.] I understood when I made that reply to Mr. Stevens that he was referring to the Ohau section. I was confused then. I had had no time to think over my evidence. I have thought over it since. Nobody has told me anything. Nobody has told me what the sequence of the cases was. The minutes of the Court have not been interpreted to me. I am quite sure that Raumatangi was not offered to the descendants of Whatanui before Ohau. [Horowhenua Commission, page 169, question 348, read.] I don't know that I said that. [Question 349 read.] That is correct. [Question 350 read.] I don't remember giving that answer. [Question 351 read.] I remember giving that answer; it referred to the 100 acres. [Question 352 read.] That is correct. [Question 353 read.] That is correct. [Question 354 read.] That is not correct. I don't think I gave that reply to Mr. Stevens. If I did it was because I was not prepared. [Question 355 read.] I don't remember that I said that, but if it is in the minutes I will not deny it. [Question 356 read.] I don't remember saying that. The question or my reply must have been misinterpreted. [Question 357 read.] I said that. [Question 358 read.] I don't know that that is what I said. [Question 359 read.] I said that; but it was arranged in Palmerston in 1886 that No. 9 was for the descendants of Whatanui. [Question 360 read.] I don't know that I said that. [Question 361 read.] I have always said that No. 9 was not cut off first. It was cut off for the same purpose as the Ohau section. [Question 362 read.] I said that. [Question 363 read.] That is what I said. [Question 364 read.] I did not say that I knew that Ohau was the first section agreed to by Muaupoko for descendants of Whatanui. [Question 365 read.] I remember saying that; but I did not say that No. 9 was