

give them back to the people. I do not know that he asked Ihaia. Kemp would not consent. It was then that I heard that No. 9 had been set apart for the descendants of Whatanui. I said to Kemp, "You are cutting up only the part of the block belonging to me and my hapu." In the evening, when we assembled in the *whare rumanga*, I asked Kemp what he was going to do with the land for the *rerewaho*. The house was crowded. He said he should have that piece. I then asked what was to become of the *rerewaho*. He said, "We will put them in No. 11." I told him I would not consent, as he had consumed all the land. That ended our conversation.

Mr. McDonald asked to be allowed to postpone his cross-examination of the witness till to-morrow.

The Court saw no objection, if Mr. Stevens was ready to go on.

Cross-examined by Mr. Stevens.

Witness: I did not remain at Palmerston for more than a day at a time in 1886. I returned to Oroua in the evenings. Kemp did not speak to me about the Ohau lands in 1886 at Palmerston. I believe my son Eparamia was Kemp's clerk in 1886. Rangimairehau told me after the Ohau land had been taken into Court that it had been cut off for the descendants of Whatanui. I am sure it was not No. 9 that Rangimairehau spoke of. It was the land at Ohau, east of the railway, that he spoke of. If Kemp said that No. 14 was his share of the land it would be incorrect. I have not received a penny of the rent for No. 14.

Cross-examined by Hamuera Karaitiana.

Witness: I did not hear Te Rangimairehau say that No. 14 was given to Kemp for himself. If he had said so I would have been angry.

The Court adjourned till the 1st April.

THURSDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1897.

The Court opened at 10 a.m.

Present: The same.

No. 1, Horowhenua, No. 14, resumed.

PAKI TE HUNGA cross-examined by Mr. McDonald.

Witness: I am quite clear that I was informed that the Ohau section was the first section awarded to the descendants of Whatanui. I did not hear it stated during the sitting of the Court of 1886 that it had afterwards been given by the Muaupoko to Kemp for himself. I only heard that in this Court. I have claims to all the divisions held by Kemp and others—I mean Nos. 6, 11, 12, and 14. I have never agreed to Kemp having No. 14 for himself. I have never been asked to agree. If I had been asked to agree I would not have done so.

Cross-examined by Mr. Baldwin.

Witness [Horowhenua Commission, page 156, questions 341 to 355, and replies, read]: Some of that evidence is correct, but most of it is incorrectly reported. [Question 341 and reply read.] That is correct. [Question 342 and reply read.] That is wrong. It is not the correct interpretation of what I said. All my claims are from Pariri, not from Riunga. I am descended from the latter, but that ancestor had no rights in Horowhenua. [Horowhenua Commission, page 157, questions 389, 390, and 391, with replies, read.] Those replies are also incorrectly interpreted. I did not say it. I repeat that I am a descendant of Riunga, but I do not claim from her. All my claims are from Pariri. I never said before the Commission that I claimed Horowhenua from Riunga. [Horowhenua Commission, page 156, question 343, and reply, read.] That was my reply. [Question 344 and reply read.] That is correct. [Question 345 and reply read.] I said that. [Question 346 and reply read.] That is right. [Question 347 and reply read.] It was No. 9 I spoke to Kemp about at Pipiriki, not No. 14. By No. 9 I meant the section at Raumatangi. I spoke to Kemp about it at Pipiriki meeting. I told him he was cutting up only the parts I and my hapu were interested in. [Horowhenua Commission, question 348, and reply, read.] I spoke to Kemp about the *rerewaho* land just after I spoke to him about No. 9. My reply to question 348 referred to No. 9, and not to No. 14. I said that Kemp was cutting out both sections from Ngatipariri lands. I spoke to Kemp about No. 14, inasmuch as it was Ngatipariri lands, I meant to include it when I spoke to Kemp about cutting up Ngatipariri lands. [Question 349 and reply read.] That is correct. It was at Pipiriki. I heard Kemp propose that he should take the land for the *rerewaho*. Kemp did not reply to what I said about the proposal. [Question 350 and reply read.] That is true. I did not speak to Kemp about No. 14 then. I did not speak to Kemp, specially to Kemp, about No. 14 at Pipiriki. I included all our land because I had ascertained that two sections had been cut out of our land, Nos. 9 and 14. I said to Kemp, "You are cutting up my land and that of my hapu only; I will not agree to this." I did not refer to the Ohau section by its number. [Question 351 and reply read.] That is quite correct. [Question 352 and reply read.] That was my reply. [Question 353 and reply read.] That is correct. [Question 354 and reply read.] I said that. [Question 255 and reply read.] That is quite correct. [Question 356 and reply read.] That is true. With my explanation, all my evidence that you have read is correct, except that relating to Te Riunga. I said that Te Riunga's rights were south of Ohau section, not this side of it, and that Te Riunga's land had been taken by Ngatiraukawa. I won't admit that my reply to question 391 is correctly reported. [Volume 13, page 231, Paki's evidence, read: "I was not present at the Court in 1886. I went to my place at Oroua Bridge. I was not present when the arrangements were made outside."] I was present at meetings in Palmerson's barn in 1886. Te Rangimairehau told me what had been settled at the meetings and in the Court.