

10. Then, why did you oppose Hare Rakena's case at the Court?—Because he partly claimed to be a successor to Te Peeti te Aweawe.

11. You say your reason for objecting to Hare Rakena was because he claimed to be successor to Te Peeti?—That was his case. His first claim was inclusion in the land, and the conductors would not agree to it. Then he said he would claim to come in as successor to Te Peeti. I objected to him claiming to be successor to Te Peeti, because Te Peeti had a child of his own.

12. Well, did you make any objection to his claim for rightful ownership in the land?—No, because he had a right to come in; but the conductors having shut him out, I was not in a position to say anything, because I was not aware of what they were doing.

13. Did you say that Hare had quite as good a right as any of the rest of them?—I have said that Hare was a child of Te Aweawe, and therefore had a right to the land.

14. And you say that Mr. Morison was wrong in setting up the wife of Te Aweawe as having a right to the land?—Yes. She had no right to this place, but had right to other parts of the land.

*Mr. Sheridan:* The ownership of Kaihinu No. 2 was ascertained by the Native Land Court in 1871, and the subsequent Courts were bound to adopt this ownership, and could not add to it or diminish from it except by bringing in the successors of deceased owners up to that time. These recent Courts did not pretend at all to try the ownership of the land. They adopted and were bound to adopt the order made in 1871.

15. *Mr. Hone Heke* (to Rewanui).] Has Hare Rakena any right under the Crown grant issued in 1871 to the Kaihinu No. 2 Block?—I think the law has thrown open a means for inclusion, and that those should be put in who were left out by the Court.

16. *Mr. Wi Pere.*] Does Hare come in under the descendants originally established?—Yes, if you are asking me about Tawhakahiku.

17. Legislation was passed empowering the Court to deal with this matter, and, as part of the proceedings under that, an agreement was arrived at by certain persons outside the Court?—Yes.

18. Who was the principal man from whom the idea originated?—It was Mr. Morison, Mr. Fraser, and the other conductors.

19. You must understand that that agreement was the reason why the Court did not carefully inquire into the matter?—Well, they drew up that agreement. I am not responsible for it.

20. The agreement that it is alleged you signed: where is that agreement?—I signed my name to no agreement.

21. But it is said that Mr. Moffatt has in his possession an agreement?—Well, his grandmother, Ereni, has been to ask him where the document is that we signed, and he said that he did not know.

*Mr. Wi Pere:* My reason for asking about the agreement is because it has been quoted as governing the whole thing, and as having prevented the Court making the inquiry it was authorised by law to make. The conductors, Mr. Fraser and Mr. Morison, state that it was made by you people yourselves, that you drew up the agreement, and the Court acted upon it. I see there is no such agreement in existence, and it is no good asking anything more about it.

22. *Mr. Hone Heke.*] You are being asked about the agreement laid before the Court?—I never authorised Mr. Morison to appear.

23. Did you sign the first agreement?—I did not. He never asked me to sign an agreement or anything else. None of us signed.

24. *The Chairman.*] Was there not an agreement before the Court?—There was, but they alone were responsible for it.

25. That is not an answer to my question. Was there not an agreement before the Court?—That is what they say.

26. I do not want to know what they say; I want to know what you say?—I do not know. All that I know is that there was a list of names that had been written down and were read out—people whom they had found entitled to receive money, they being prominent owners of the land. That I saw read out.

27. You were in the Court at the reading-out?—Yes, at the last reading-out.

28. Did the Judge ask whether there was any Native objection to the agreement?—I did not hear that, because everybody was talking all at once. They were angered about Hare Rakena being put out—that is, Hare, son of Te Aweawe.

29. Did you not object to Hare Rakena being included?—I objected to him being put in as successor to Te Peeti, but not to being put in under his ancestral right.

30. Did you not object to a sum of money—£100—being given to him?—I never heard of that £100; £50 was what I was told.

31. Did you object to him being paid £50?—I would not agree to Te Peeti's money being paid to him, because Te Peeti had a child of his own.

32. When was the last Court held that this came before?—The 28th February, 1905, and the award was given on the 4th March. The Court was adjourned from the 24th February to the 28th.

33. The decision was given on the 4th March?—Yes.

34. Did the Judge not base his decision upon that agreement?—I did not hear the Court say anything. All the Court did was to agree to the proposals made by the conductors. He did not say anything further.

35. I am speaking of the last Court—the Court of Appeal. On what grounds did they base their decision in the case?—The Court did not read out its decision. It said the Court would not take long to decide the case, which would be dismissed, because Rewanui did not stand up and object to the agreement in the first Court, and the whole of the £20 deposit was taken by the Court.