

any objection to it. I did not hear of any gift of £100 to Kemp. It is too late to object now. I do not object. It was a gift by Muaupoko to Kemp. I have not heard of an order being given by Kemp to McDonald to pay Ihaia Taueki and others a sum of £300 in 1886. This is the first I have heard of it. I object because I did not receive any of the money. Kemp should be made to account for it. I object to the item £50 paid for sheep for Te Aue Puihi. Kemp should account for this to the tribe. I object to the £125 paid for sheep for Raniera being charged against the moneys derived from the land. I deny that Warena got £70 from Kemp in 1882, or at any other time. Kemp sent Warena £40 by wire in 1887. Kemp did not say where he got the money from. It was his own. I cannot agree to its being made a charge against Horowhenua. Warena and I supposed that it came out of moneys derived from No. 3. I admit that Kemp gave Warena £100 in Wellington. Do not remember date. I think it was part of the proceeds of the sale of the township. I received the £100 from Kemp in Wellington. Later on he gave me £100 in Palmerston. I deny that I received another £100 from Kemp in Wellington. I received two sums of £100 each from Kemp in Wanganui. Kemp paid £33 for some horses of mine that were impounded in Palmerston. I believe I have received £400 odd altogether from Kemp. I admit that the majority of Muaupoko received the £1,000 sent by Kemp to Makere. Kemp and I had begun to quarrel then. I have only now heard of the payment of £100 to Rangimairehau. I object to this, as I have done to all other payments to individuals. I make the same objection to the £100 paid to Hapeta Taueki. The £800 will be distributed to the persons found entitled.

The Court adjourned till the 26th instant.

LEVIN, MONDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1897.

The Court opened at 10 a.m.

Present: The same.

Inquiry *re* accounts resumed. Objectors' case continued.

*Mr. McDonald* wished to know how the fees were to be charged in this case.

*The Court* informed him that each party would have to pay their own.

WIRIHANA HUNIA's examination in chief continued.

*Witness:* I think the £75 paid by Kemp to you in 1886 is a private matter between you. I know nothing of it. I do not consider that it should be made a charge against the people. I do not know anything about the £400 paid by H. McDonald to Mr. Baker on Kemp's order. I do not consider it should be made a charge against moneys derived from Horowhenua. I know nothing of the £400 paid to Mr. Baker by J. R. McDonald in 1888. It should not be made a charge against Horowhenua moneys. The £300 paid to Baker in 1889 is a matter between Baker and Kemp. I object to it. I also object to the £300 paid to Baker by Bell, Gully, and Izard on Kemp's order. I make the same objection to the sums of £105 5s. and £10 10s. paid by Kemp to Bell, Gully, and Izard in 1890. The sum of £631 paid by Kemp to J. M. Fraser is a matter between them. It should not be charged to the people. The item £33 12s. paid to Cuff I object to. I object also to the £28 11s. paid for Court fees. Warena paid for the Court fees on his side. I object to the £43 paid to Rota Tahiwiri. I object also to the payment of £840 to Mr. Edwards, solicitor. I object to the £52 10s. paid to Mr. Skerrett. I object to the item £2,098 8s. 7d. being charged against moneys accruing from Horowhenua. Warena and I paid all our own expenses. The expenditure of these moneys became necessary, owing to the misconduct by Kemp of the affairs of this land. Kemp has been the cause of all the trouble. The first wrong done by Kemp was the misappropriation of the rents received under the lease executed in 1874. My father and I and some of the Muaupoko went to Wellington several times to endeavour to get Horowhenua subdivided and Kemp removed from his trusteeship, but we did not succeed. I was not satisfied with Kemp's appropriation of the rents of No. 11 after 1886, and Warena applied in consequence for partition of No. 11. He also took action in the Supreme Court to compel Kemp to account for the rents received by him for No. 11. That was the beginning of the trouble between Kemp and myself. It has gone on ever since. The Supreme Court referred the matter to the Native Land Court in 1890. Kemp and I tried to come to some arrangement, but nothing came of it. His advisers prevented it. I think this was before we went into the Court of 1890. We proposed to cut off a piece of land for Warena, another for Kemp, and give the balance to the people. Hoani Taipua and Karena-te-mana-o-tawhaki endeavoured to bring about the arrangement. Kemp agreed. Under the proposal Warena was to have 3,500 acres. Kemp was to have the same area, and the tribe the balance. I think this proposal came from Warena's side. The location of Warena's area was not mentioned, nor was Kemp's at that time. Kemp and Warena both agreed to the arrangement. I think Mr. J. M. Fraser prevented it being carried out. Warena's solicitor tried his best to have the matter arranged. The negotiations were conducted through Kemp and myself. As no settlement was arrived at in Palmerston, we came to Pipiriki, where the negotiations fell through altogether. The first I heard of it being necessary for us to go into Court was that Fraser had prevented a settlement. Kemp told me this. We then went into Court. When the case came on I wished to state my claims to the land. I did not want to turn everybody off it. I intended to protect the rights of my hapu. I objected to their being left in Kemp's hands, as we were discontented with Kemp's administration. I was present in the rehearing Court of 1891. I made the same claim in that Court as I had in the previous one. The Pipiriki meeting took place after this Court. It was at that meeting the location of Warena's area was mentioned. One of the proposals was that it was to be at Te Kawiu. Ihaia Taueki made this proposal. Kemp's 3,500 acres was to be at Waiwiri. Ihaia said that Meiha Keepa should go on to the Ngatipariri side. Rangimairehau proposed that Warena's